

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE suddenness of the Axis collapse in North Africa inevitably excites hopes of a similar breakdown on the continent of Europe. This we devoutly hope may be the case: already there are reports, founded or unfounded, of German admissions that the Italian surrender will not be long delayed, and that the end in Germany is only a matter of time. The only sound policy, however, is to assume that resistance will be resolute and prolonged, and to prepare accordingly. Hitler hopes that Germany will hold out longer than Allied unity, and that U-boat attrition and strikes, national jealousies and class conflicts, will enable him to husband sufficient strength to secure a compromise peace. The United Nations cannot afford to relax their efforts in production or in co-operation, and the need for wise propaganda and constant mutual interpretation between the United States, Russia, China, and Britain was never more clamant. And employers and employed need to be reminded constantly that if they rock the boat too violently they will both be in the water and may lose all.

It is possible that Italy will not be able to stand large-scale bombing for long, and that as the experience of the Ruhr becomes that of central and eastern Germany the hopelessness of the struggle will become evident to the German people. It is this fact which justifies night-bombing—the hope that in the long run such bombing will lead to the economy of human life, of the enemy as of our own Forces and people. No Christian justifies the bombing of a civilian population, but there is little doubt that Axis propaganda is playing on the sentiment of the British and American people in the hope that bombing will be relaxed—with the resultant prolongation of the war, the loss of many more lives, and may be invasions by land at great cost. We have no desire to see Rome bombed, but if the bombing of Rome would shorten the war by one day and save a single life, then we should be prepared to steel our hearts. Those who refused to believe that Hitler meant what he said in *Mein Kampf*, and who steadfastly held that no man could harbour his predatory intentions or that if he did his people would disown him; those who resisted all preparations to withstand the aggressor when he was piling up armaments, and for years tried to appease him; all these must not now flinch because they have to pay in agony and pain by the sight of manifold horrors; and they must not weaken the resolve of those who, risking their

own lives from day to day, are determined to make it crystal clear to the aggressor nations that their policy has not paid and will never pay. The sentimentalists, if care is not taken, will, to save the lives of thousands now, spend the lives of hundreds of thousands in 1944, as well as make probable the sacrifice of another generation twenty years hence. This view must be maintained even while the Christian stresses the value of the individual soul in the sight of God, and dedicates himself to the fight against war and every other evil thing which jeopardizes the individual. It is one of the major tragedies of war that it leaves Christians with the choice between evils only: for a Christian to have to decide—as Cromwell did with much searching of heart, and we must do in our turn—that ruthlessness today is the only way to save life in the long run, tears the heart into shreds; but is there in June, 1943, any alternative? At the moment (June 5) there is a lull. In Russia, in China, in the Pacific, anywhere on the continent of Europe we may be on the eve of great events. The Prime Minister is back, but has not yet reported to Parliament. The quarter's news has been encouraging, and events in the Argentine show the trend of public opinion about the outcome of the war. It is to be hoped that the Axis powers are as ignorant of the plans of the leaders of the United Nations as are the people of those nations—one of the most striking features of the war, especially remembering the existence of broadcasting, is the way it has been possible to keep secrets. We begin as we ended with the hope that German morale may crack as suddenly as did the resistance in N. Africa, and the autumn see us within sight of peace.

* * *

WE have commented before on the way theological thought reflects events, even as the dogmatists are pale replicas of the dictators. So it is that today we see a heightening of the colours in which the sin of man is portrayed. The evil in man's heart has been revealed in all its horror: we once heard Dr. R. F. Horton, in one of his *macabre* moods, preach a sermon in which he described a picture of the human heart which showed all the evil therein—"evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornication, thefts, false witness, railings", as *Matthew* has it. Cruelty and lust, brutality and oppression, have been exposed without the veneer with which civilization has covered them, and so it comes about that many of our preachers expound the sinfulness of sin as if that were the whole of the Gospel, as indeed it seems to be the totality of their message. But even while we are appalled at man's inhumanity to man which makes countless thousands mourn, at the same time we stand in wonder and amaze at the courage and endurance, the heroism and the sacrifice, of ordinary folk. These, too, are part of the data a warring world presents to the thinker. And these are

the things in man Jesus Himself never forgot. He knew man's sin, but He knew that man was worth saving. And it is not the sin of man which is the Gospel, but the grace of God, which is mighty to save, and can save to the uttermost.

* * *

ARE we wrong in thinking that the war years have seen a steady decline in the quality of broadcasting in Britain? It seems to us that the standards have been lowered in almost every department. Certainly we have heard nothing filthier, on the stage or on the air, than a music-hall programme from a Yorkshire town a few weeks ago. It would be interesting to learn the names of the B.B.C. officials who have such a low opinion of the tastes, culture, and morals of the Services. They should somehow be made to realize how thousands of men and women in the Forces loathe the programmes and resent the constantly reiterated suggestion that all they are interested in is drink and sex. Unhappily, politicians and soldiers in high place give them support—witness the officer speaking from North Africa who had the effrontery—and how tactless even if true!—to say that nothing was more in the minds of men than letters from home, “unless it be beer”.

Perhaps it would be too much to expect the Religious Department of the B.B.C. to keep an eye on these tendencies, though they might rightly be regarded as within its province, for it is to be hoped that the Department does not believe that worship and discussion comprise the whole of religion. But even in that narrower field we are conscious of a decline in quality, and we find in many diverse quarters a genuine concern about it, even by those who recognize the great difficulties resulting from the reduction in the number of programmes. Travel in all parts of the country drives home the impression that fewer people now listen to religious broadcasts than at any time since broadcasting began. Nor is it any reply to this to say that four million people listen in at 7.55 a.m., for probably most of these have tuned in for the 8 o'clock news. And the comments of these secular folk on what they happen to hear at five minutes to eight are sometimes inflammatory! In pre-war days the number of listeners—and worshippers—at the Sunday evening services was considerable; that audience has been lost, and the audience at the—sometimes very poor—community hymn-singing is not sufficient compensation.

Those responsible for religious broadcasting no doubt have to fight hard against other claims; they deserve the sympathy and need the help of the churches. Is sufficient being done by all denominations to assist them? If it be true that the officials consist of five clergymen—four Anglican and one Presbyterian, one weakness is at once revealed. Why all clergymen, why no Free Churchmen? Who appoints the Religious Advisory Committee and to

whom is it responsible? Do its members represent anybody and report to anybody? If something is not done, and that soon, it will once more have to be chronicled that the powers of evil have exploited a new medium more quickly and more effectively than the powers of good. Timid and tepid addresses by safe people—the same names over and over again, platitudes that are not always pious, fear lest any speaker should offend against sound doctrine or step beyond the bounds of conventional religion—these are the criticisms heard wherever Christians gather together. Does the B.B.C. know about them? Does the Religious Department think that all is well with its work? Does it know how few young people listen to its programmes, and what they say about them if they happen to do so? And has it the least idea of the opinions expressed in the average Ministers' Fraternal?

The reading of Miss Dorothy L. Sayers's broadcast plays, *The Man Born To Be King* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.), has added to our disquiet. Good wine needs no bush, but these plays are introduced by a chorus of mutual congratulation unparalleled unless it be at the Annual Assembly of a religious denomination. "Colossal", "tremendous", "stupendous", "immense"—whatever the words in the American song may be—flashed into our minds as Dr. Welch told us that Miss Sayers was wonderful, and Miss Sayers explained that Dr. Welch and Mr. Gielgud were marvellous, and Mr. Gielgud that . . . This really will not do. To laud these plays as if they were second in importance only to the Incarnation itself verges on the ridiculous, if not the blasphemous.

The plays themselves we were unable to hear, but from many quarters we have heard that they were "made" by superb acting. That we should imagine to be true; the danger with these, as with so many religious plays, is that with poor speaking and much less than good acting they prove a "flop", and do more harm than good. If our experience is anything to go by, these plays do not hold the reader. In the "Notes on the Characters"—and sometimes in the Introduction—Miss Sayers's genius is evident, but it is not conspicuous in the plays. Indeed, if we were examining her examination papers, she would get *alpha* for detective stories, *beta* for theology, and *gamma*—or maybe *gamma plus*—for drama. That the B.B.C. should make such a song about them is an indication that all is not well, and adds to our concern.

Admitting that the novel is an easier medium than the play, we found Mr. Manuel Komroff's *In the Years of our Lord* (Chapman & Hall, 8s. 6d.) a much more vivid reproduction of the Gospel story than that of Miss Sayers, but, oh that someone would explain to him the difference between "shall" and "will", "should" and "would": sentences such as "we will be overheard" frequently recur.

THE middle name of Miss Kate L. Mitchell, the author of *India: An American View* (Lane, 10s. 6d.), should have been "But" or "The fact remains": whenever she mentions—and it is not often—that the British connexion with India has been of any service to India, there immediately follows a "but". Suspicion is thrown on every step taken to further self-government: the sentence "that united determination to achieve freedom and social progress which the Cripps Mission has consciously or unconsciously succeeded in weakening" is typical. Miss Mitchell likes Mr. Jinnah and the Moslem League only less than the British Government; Mr. Gandhi, too, though he is credited with immense political astuteness, is generally featured as a mere tool in the hands of the Indian propertied classes, who use him

as the man to unleash just enough mass activity to secure concessions from the British, and at the same time save India from a genuine revolutionary movement.

There are Americans, we rejoice to know, who have emancipated themselves from such a one-eyed view as Miss Mitchell offers: at this time of day it is a pity that such stuff can masquerade as history. Needless to say, there is not a word about the work of British missionaries in India, or about liberal views in Britain.

To turn from Miss Mitchell's book to Prof. R. Coupland's *Indian Politics, 1936-1942* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), Part II of his "Report on the Constitutional Problem of India", is like gazing into a clear lake after looking at a muddied pool. If only Miss Mitchell would master the summaries (of both parts) contained in this Report, observe how Prof. Coupland does not choose the facts, but marshals all of them and maintains the historian's objectivity, it would be useful discipline. The British have made many mistakes in India, and there are episodes of which they must needs be ashamed; many of them have exploited the country and treated its people as if they were less than men. But that is not the whole story, and it is the whole story America and the world should be told. And men who approach the task in the spirit and with the knowledge and judgment of Prof. Coupland are the people to do it.

Mr. H. N. Brailsford's *Subject India* (Gollancz, 6s.) falls between the other two books; its sincerity and its passion for all downtrodden and oppressed people are backed by personal knowledge. Nevertheless, while the book is salutary and painful reading for Englishmen, it cannot but do harm in India, for Mr. Brailsford maintains that as yet there has been no genuine offer of independence to India and that the Cripps Mission was to all intents and purposes dishonest: until we insist that the Princes—"protected puppets of the Paramount Power"—democratize their States, there is no hope of freedom for India. Throughout the case against Britain is emphasized in the text, and recent improvements rele-

gated to footnotes. Last year's shootings and imprisonments are duly chronicled, but we have noticed no mention of outrages by Indians and the burning of British airmen. The verdict on British rule is thus expressed:

Through a century the English conquerors took upon their shoulders the responsibility for governing this population. They dwelt amid its poverty, its ignorance, its physical misery and its helplessness, and never dreamed of using the immense resources of the efficient machinery of government which they had created to teach it, to heal it, to organise it out of its backwardness and inertia. They aggravated the pressure on the soil by hurrying the destruction of handicraft, and postponing the growth of industry. By suppressing, until our own day, all political initiative among the governed, they lamed its will and checked the working of its powers of adaptation; they violently changed its economic environment, yet they held in check the forces in Indian society which would have reacted to the new conditions . . .

The part played by exorbitant rents and usury in India's poverty are mentioned, but they do not receive the same condemnation as British exploitation.

Mr. Brailsford is all on the side of Congress; "Indian geography", he says, "is not as simple as Mr. Jinnah's logic". Nor is it as simple as Mr. Brailsford's politics! He is probably right—though Ulster stands as warning to the contrary—in holding that the religious cleavage is not the most important, and that Hindu and Moslem together suffer under the same economic grievances, but he has no settled opinion about the caste system—on one page it is rigid, on another it is breaking down, and so on.

A scheme for a move forward from the present impasse is suggested—a Pacific Charter, the transfer of India to the Dominions Office, a new Viceroy, with an amnesty and the calling off of the Congress revolt, Viceregal advice to the Princes to concede full rights to their subjects, the six Congress ministries to resume office, an agreement over Pakistan, the formation of a National Government to conduct the war effort and draft a constitution, new elections on the cessation of war, and then a treaty fixing relations with the British Commonwealth. For these developments it is suggested that Mr. Churchill is unfitted:

The Empire is being liquidated. No boast of Mr. Churchill's at a Mansion House banquet will suffice to keep it intact. This unusual man has some of the elements of greatness—an indomitable will, the fighting temperament, a single-track mind that runs straight to its goal, an enviable ability to ignore the opinions of men beyond his own chosen circle, an unshakeable faith in his own star, firm roots in tradition, an ability to express much that average Englishmen feel in words that

reveal the consummate artist. A blinkered vision is combined with the genius for action. But however high we may rate Mr. Churchill—and it is easy for those who respect courage and artistry to rate him too high—no man's will can turn back the dial of history. . . . He will not change his mind: he is capable only of a possessive attitude towards our Asiatic dependencies. The best to hope for is that under the pressure of realities he may consent to stand aside in silence and allow others to settle this matter.

* * *

THE relevance of the first part of Dr. Charles Singer's *The Christian Failure* (Gollancz, 3s. 6d.) is not altogether apparent, unless it be an attempt to make the reader believe in the objectivity of the writer. Dr. Singer's real purpose is to attack the Christian Church for its long failure to witness and sacrifice for the Christian idea of the dignity of man, and its more recent failure to come to the rescue of the oppressed Jews in Germany. He contrasts what the 100,000 Jews in Britain in 1890 did for their brethren (settled and absorbed 200,000 and sent 1,000,000 more on their way) with the failure of 40,000,000 Christians in Britain in 1919 to care for 100,000 Assyrian Christians. He quotes Christians from Luther ("Whoever would shelter, feed or honour them [Jews], with their poisonous tongues, devil's spawn, our bitterest enemies, does but bring dishonour and a curse upon himself") to Karl Heim ("In all political and economic respects I am in full agreement with Adolf Hitler") in an indictment Christians would do well to face:

How often one hears of some detestable action or attitude of the Church: "Oh, but that isn't Christianity". But it is Christianity; it is historic Christianity. Whatever pang the limitation may cost the Christian, he cannot be allowed to choose his history, or even to select from it. All that has been is history, and the individual Christian of our day is the heir of the whole historic record of the Christian religion and of Christian civilisation. We live in this moment which, at the next, goes past recall to make us what we shall be. What we do at this moment will be still with us in the next and each one of us is heir of all that has been. History is utterly unforgiving and ruthless.

The acts of the Spanish Inquisition; the massacre of the Albigenses; the record of Luther with reference to the Peasants' Revolt and royal divorce; the inhuman temper of Calvin; the evil lives and designed cruelty of many of the Popes; and, in our time, the temporising of Christians and of Churches with the evil forces that have overwhelmed much of the world; these are, for comparative and scientific purposes, as essential parts of the history of Christianity as are the lives of the saints. All these events, in sober fact, have had their

share in shaping current Christianity. They have had their share in shaping Christians themselves.

Some may say that from these acts, these records, these attitudes, these lives, the spirit of Christ had wholly departed. Let it be so. We have not been discussing the spirit of Christ, but the record, and to claim that these things are not representative of the historic process known as Christianity is to attempt to falsify the record. Torquemada, Luther, Calvin, Innocent III, Alexander VI were official exponents of Christianity. They were, indeed the very embodiments of its history. They were typical products of the history of Christianity just as they shaped the history of Christianity. The Christian apologist must answer for them.

While it is true that Dr. Singer contrasts all that is worst in Christianity's record with all that is best in that of Judaism, that is no reason for refusing to face unpleasant facts. Meanwhile the question of anti-Semitism remains, baffling and almost incomprehensible.

One of the charges made against the successful Jew is that he is "aggressive"; in *The Great Hatred* (Gollancz, 3s. 6d.) Mr. Maurice Samuel seems determined to live up to it. He is impatient to the point of contempt with all who do not see anti-Semitism as he sees it, *i.e.*, not as mere racial antagonism, "not as sporadic eruption of unchristian sentiment, but a vast upsurge of the aboriginal hatred of Christ, and therefore the heresy of heresies". The Nazi attack on the Jews, that is to say, is due to the fact that the Jews are the "Christ-givers", and it is worse than the Communist attack on Christianity because the latter is open, while the former is disguised, resorting "to the psychological strategy of deflecting its hatred upon the Jews". Mr. Samuel does good service in that he accepts no easy and casual explanations, but goes to the roots of the matter; his book, therefore, while it may often irritate, well deserves reading.

* * *

AN excellent piece of work by Dr. F. L. Cross, Librarian of Pusey House, leaves us disturbed and unhappy. *Darwell Stone* (Dacre Press, 30s.) contains "Some Personal Memories" by Canon Frederic Hood, over 220 pp. of "Life", 100 pp. of "Letters", and 90 pp. of "Papers". We should therefore have an adequate picture of the life and work of the Anglo-Catholic scholar who was for so long Principal of Pusey House. And so we have: we see him at his 13 hours of work a day, engaged in ceaseless controversy and correspondence for the cause in which he believed, and toiling at the preparation of a Lexicon of Patristic Greek. We learn of his speeches in Convocation, of his books, and of his activity in, and against, Prayer Book Revision. We are invited to regard him

as a saint, and our unhappiness arises because we are unable to do so. This is not, we think, because we deem his views of Christianity and the Church so palpably mistaken, but because there is no indication in these pages that his heart was ever aflame with the suffering and poverty, the oppression and agony, of the world of his day. A saint, it may be granted, can live a scholar's life, and, saying "This one thing I do", concentrate on a mental task to which he believes himself called. But can a man, even though he says Mass every day, be deemed a saint if his outlook be rigidly limited, and his life without practical service for his fellows? To Stone all that India seems to be is a place where a Church Union Scheme crosses his opinions, and a reference to "those who had made the great sacrifice for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake which the call to religion involves" indicates his view as well as his biographer's—as if the sacrifices were made only by those who live in community, and not by those who spend themselves for Christ's sake in city slum and squalid street. Look at the subjects of Stone's letters: in July, 1915, when war was raging, he discusses whether baptism is valid if the water does not flow, and if the wet finger on the forehead does not move; in 1918 he decides that "war bread" can be validly consecrated if the proportion of non-wheaten material is not too large. And so on. The contrast between One who went about doing good, who mixed with publicans and sinners, is too marked to be missed; and in so far as he represents the aloofness of the Church from the lives of ordinary men, Darwell Stone illustrates the Church's failure.

It may be, of course, that Dr. Cross, in his desire to do justice to Dr. Stone's patristic learning and his unstinted service to the Anglo-Catholic cause, has overlooked human elements which would invalidate all we have said. But Dr. Cross is himself too good a scholar for this to be true. A man may serve God and his fellows in a cloister and in sustained study, but all the time as we read of Stone's activities we felt he was tithing mint, anise, and cummin, and forgetting the weightier matters of the law, that to the defence of a narrow and intolerant section of the Church he had dedicated gifts meant for mankind.

* * *

THOSE who are watching the discussions of the Church Union Scheme in South India will note with interest two references in the biography just mentioned:

the fact remains . . . that the High Anglican and Protestant ecclesiologies are irreconcilable, and that the union . . . cannot be carried through unless one side or the other abandons principles which it has hitherto held to be fundamental.

Again:

Among the various subjects that called for examination

were . . . the legitimacy, in virtue of "economy", of some departure from strict Catholic practice over a limited *interim* period (for the advocates of the scheme held that the obstacles from the standpoint of Catholic practice would all be remedied after a period of some thirty years).

* * *

THE negotiations for union between the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church, about which Dr. Douglas Horton wrote in our last issue, are continuing, and the provisional draft (March, 1943) of the Basis of Union is now before us. It contains a brief history of the two Communion, and also some informing comparative statistics, from which it appears that the distribution of churches through the 48 States is very uneven. In the six New England States, *e.g.*, the Evangelical and Reformed churches number 12 only, against 1,621 Congregational; on the other hand, they have 890 churches in Pennsylvania, where the Congregational figure is 117. The only other States where there is an Evangelical and Reformed majority are Ohio (359 against 353), Missouri (162 against 48), Maryland (81 against 8), West Virginia (10 against 5), and Texas (56 against 22). In the Middle West the division is fairly even. The totals for the country are: Evangelical and Reformed, 2,850 churches, with 662,953 members; Congregational Christian, 5,803, with 1,049,746 members. One minor advantage of the union would be the disappearance of the cumbrous and ambiguous name, "Congregational Christian", which resulted, of course, from the union of the Congregational and Christian groups some years ago. A major advantage will be that it will bring into association with Congregationalism churches that have their roots in the continent of Europe. The international aspect of Congregationalism's witness suffers because so far the English-speaking element has had a monopoly. There are many churches on the continent whose *ethos* is similar to that of the Congregational churches; if they can be brought into the International Congregational Council in due course, the influence of that Council will be vastly increased.

* * *

MANY people in this country would do well to take to heart a remark by Dr. D. A. McGregor at the 50th Congress of the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. Dr. McGregor wondered why he had been invited to speak at a Parent-Teachers Association in New York, and this is what he was told:

One Sunday morning . . . I was driving in the country. I turned the radio on and a man was just starting to make a speech. I did not get his name. I soon saw he was talking about education, and I listened. Very soon I discovered he was a clergyman. I listened now because I was interested. I

heard the speech through. That minister got through his whole speech of half an hour about education and the Christian Church and never once damned the Godless public school system. I wanted to meet a man who talked like that . . . and so I asked you to come.

Clergymen and other supporters of the dual system commenting on Council Schools—please note!

* * *

DR. J. MACALISTER BREW'S *In the Service of Youth* (Faber, 7s. 6d.) is one of the best books for workers in youth clubs that we have met. If some of its illustrations are chestnuty, if there is some repetition, and if numbers and initials do go wrong on pp. 290 and 178, these are minor blemishes on a volume which is the "practical manual of work among adolescents" it sets out to be. Dr. Brew speaks out of her own experience: she has known and worked in clubs of many kinds; with shrewdness and with humour she guides and warns and stimulates. Those in the churches who do nothing for young people and yet who blame them for going to the public-house should profit by studying the subjects Dr. Brew found discussed by young people in 100 public-houses she visited on 100 evenings. They did not go to drink, but for companionship, and here are the things they talked about:

Food rationing, <i>etc.</i>	...	93 times
Religion		84
Films		79
War, <i>etc.</i>		76
Sport		69
Love, <i>etc.</i>		64
Employment		63
Dress		51
Weather		41
Holidays		38

There is much to give the Churches pause in Dr. Brew's study. In large measure they have lost their young people, and they have done very little for those they never had. Are they going to play their part "in the service of youth" in the next decade? Already, within the denominations and without, many plans are afoot. Their success largely depends on their motive: if it be to build up depleted congregations, failure is certain; if it be to help adolescents through difficult years without any such *arrière pensée*, then there is hope. Congregationalists in some fields are leading the way, we rejoice to say. Whether they are wise in giving their new movement—and how many we have had in a life-time!—a military flavour with the use of terms like "Front" and "Corps" we are inclined to doubt, for it may be that by the time the movement begins to function we shall be at the beginning of a

strong reaction from war and everything connected therewith. But it is well to know that responsible people realize that more must be done for the adolescents than just opening churches and Sunday schools, and expecting them to come along. Amid all the activity now centred on youth, we hope that Protestants will not overlook the success of the Roman Catholic Jocist Movement, which they will find described in Mr. Vincent Rochford's *The Young Christian Workers* (Burns, Oates, 1s.), with nine-tenths of which we find ourselves in full agreement. The *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* was started in Paris by Joseph Cardijn in 1912. Since then it has rapidly spread in Catholic circles and has won the approval of the Pope. It is confined to factory workers (surely the conditions in all factories are not so bad as is suggested), and it is argued the sound policy of evangelization (that word is not used) is to win others by organized action within their own environment: thus in time there will be Young Christian Farmers, Young Christian Students, *etc.*, as well as Young Christian Workers. The method of the Y.C.W. is simple: its members examine their lives and those of their mates, and inquiry leads them to "See, Judge, Act"—the action being both individual and collective, to help and win individuals and to alter conditions which affect life and work. There is much in this account of the movement, with its many "case-histories", from which all workers among young people could learn. A discussion of the wisdom of segregating one class like factory workers would be very helpful.

* * *

WE are not enamoured of party strife in the Church, though we welcome discussion as a sign of life: Congregationalism has always been able to shelter men of varied opinions, and no doubt it always will: the Congregational Union of England and Wales sees to it that men from the right and from the left, as well as from the centre, are called to the Chair. From this point of view we are glad to see "The Forward Books" reviewed within, though it is not clear to what forward position the little group is marching, or what is the significance of the flaming cover. The Rev. John Marsh's booklet is in some ways the most readable of the four, yet it is also the most disappointing both in form and content; its scheme is wooden—every section must begin with an illustration (the illustrations are often good)—and the aim uncertain; at the end we are left with the impression of having had a pleasant and refreshing stroll, without any destination or purpose.

Dr. Micklem's pamphlet is characteristically clever and characteristically perverse, though we much prefer him criticizing Congregationalism in the open rather than sniping at it from behind an anonymous column! One blessing of Dr. Micklem's election to the Chair is that we shall be saved from such sniping for a time at

any rate; but in any case we can quote John Saltmarsh's *Smoke in the Temple* (1646):

Let all that preach or print affix their names that we may know from whom. The contrary is a kind of unwarrantable modesty at the best. If it be truth they write, why do they not own it? If untruth, why do they write?

Dr. Micklem holds that the denomination's position is "most unenviable", for it has no Synods and its Assemblies do not meet and cannot speak as a Church. There is force in this; we never feel any Church—but this applies to Connexional Churches and Ecumenical Councils as well as Baptists and Congregationalists—is at its best in its larger Assemblies (indeed, we sometimes wonder how Christianity manages to survive them!), but we *have* known Congregational Assemblies which were true Church Meetings and denominational committees where men were conscious of the presence of God. Dr. Micklem will perhaps be better qualified to speak three years hence, when he has attended Assemblies at times other than when he has been addressing them, and when he has taken a larger share in the "donkey-work" of the denomination. He will then know, *e.g.*, that, so far from there being no pension scheme for ministers, all those who were under 35 in 1922 and all who have entered the ministry since must join a contributory pensions scheme. If Dr. Micklem were to attend his own County Union, and there put his concern about the inequalities of ministerial remuneration into a practical proposal to pool salaries, we can imagine there would be some excitement.

Of the other two books, the Rev. R. K. Orchard's is a thoughtful essay, well-deserving of study, and the Rev. John Huxtable's perhaps the best written of the four—both harbingers, we trust, of future contributions from their pens; one need not agree with all they say to appreciate the spirit in which they write and the reasonableness of their contentions.

Two points about the series in general are noticeable. First, there is the tendency to quote 17th century Congregationalism as authoritative rather than 16th, which is something like preferring second-century Christianity to first, and also to quote something called "classic Congregationalism", which means the Congregationalism most nearly akin to the views of the writers. If there is a "classic Congregationalism" it is that of the men who died for their faith in the 16th century rather than that of those who became entangled with place and power in the 17th or settled down to respectability and comfort in the 18th.

Second, there is the inclination to regard the Christian faith as a static thing, a deposit, which must be accepted as it stands, with some past century, creed, council, or theologian as the norm. We

commend to the editor the quotations from Vernon F. Storr, to be found within.

But when all has been said in the way of criticism, it must be emphasized that Congregationalism will do well to ponder seriously the disquiet which lies behind "The Forward Books". The writers are on firm ground in suggesting that the weakness of Congregationalism lies in the failure of the churches to realize their own ideal: Dr. Micklem has a fine picture of what such churches have been, can be, and ought to be. It is because church membership has ceased to be regarded seriously, because young people have been rushed into it without training and without faith and older people have failed to recognize its responsibilities, that the church meeting has decayed, because, in short, Congregationalism has ceased to be Congregational.

* * *

WE have before us a letter from one who is called in America an "educator", one who has no association with the churches, which makes some pertinent comments on one of the most difficult problems in church life—the relation between human agents and the Divine call in effecting pastoral settlements. We assume in theory that the call of a church confirms the call in a man's own soul, and at best this is so; but few, ministers and laymen alike, have not been revolted at Inductions by the attribution to the Almighty of responsibility and initiative when any amount of wire-pulling has taken place. On one occasion the secretary of the church announced:

When our church fell vacant, we consulted our Moderator, Mr. X, and told him that five names had been suggested to us. He informed us that Mr. A was not movable, that Mr. B was too old, that Mr. C had to move to another part of the country for his wife's health, and that Mr. D would not look at us, so, by the providence of Almighty God, we were led to Mr. E, whom we welcome tonight.

Rather "hard lines" on Mr. E, we agree, but surely on Almighty God too! But listen to the outside commentator:

He evidently dislikes sending references and seeming to "petition" for a church rather than be "called" by one. I cannot fully appreciate these conscientious misgivings. In the first place, how unpractical to express a desire for a church in a community where he is totally unknown if he refuses to take any steps in assisting himself to become known.

I believe in people being ethical and conscientious, but I also believe in their being practical. If a man believes he can do better work in M than in N, then he should make a positive effort to get there without any misgivings about its ethics. It is always ethical for a man to try to do his best work. What is

dubbed a "call" seems to me to be no more than a haphazard chance that someone in the community knows you would like the place and suggests your name, with the result that ministers and congregations get together with the minimum of intelligent foresight, and the few men who get big posts are either lucky and have the sponsorship of a man already powerful, or are ambitious enough to circumvent the conventions to which others feel subjected. It makes me impatient. No wonder the Protestant Churches are relatively unsuccessful when we contrast the astuteness and organization of the Catholic Church. I am not for the latter, but I am for the kind of intellectual honesty which would force churches to be more realistic. Of course I prefer a man who is sensitive to a man who is ambitious and pushful. But I am just angry at professional ethical conventions in the Church which mean that the good men deliberately shackle themselves and let the control fall into the hands of the worldly, the ambitious, and the insensitive. . . . Some of this problem arises out of the change in social pattern. In early periods when communities were static and remained intact, a congregation could choose as preacher a man from among themselves who had already shown he felt himself "called" in two ways—in his own soul and by his ability to reach and to help his neighbours. Now, with much more mobility in society, and a community no longer "set", the range of choice is great, almost international for some churches, and the whole theory of Congregational (and other) organization should be re-interpreted to preserve the spirit and not the letter.

Much attention has been paid to this as to other aspects of the problem of ministerial settlements and removals, but the problem remains. We can, at any rate, avoid insincerity and pretence; they undermine any man's ministry, and the ministry which begins with unreality and hypocrisy is doomed from the start.

* * *

READERS may care to be reminded that the recent issue of the *Transactions* of the Congregational Historical Society contains two appreciations of the late Bernard Manning—"Bernard Lord Manning, the Man", by the Rev. H. C. Carter, and "B. L. Manning, The Historian", by the Rev. A. G. Matthews. Among other articles are the Rev. J. P. Kingsland's "Lancashire College Sixty-Five Years ago", the Rev. G. F. Nuttall's "Congregational Commonwealth Incumbents", and the present writer's "A Unique Copy of a Work of Thomas Cartwright?", the account of a volume in the McAlpin Collection in the Library of the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Copies of the issue may be obtained from the Society at the Memorial Hall or from Independent Press, 3s. 6d. each; membership of the Society, 5s. yearly, gives the right to receive copies of the *Transactions* as issued.

* * *

MOST of our readers will know that the Rev. C. E. Surman is engaged on the herculean task of preparing a Directory of Congregational Biography, which will contain the names of all Congregational ministers since the emergence of Congregationalism in this country, together with the churches they served. Mr. Surman has already made great progress; his work would be facilitated if he could have a complete set of the *Congregational Year Book*. He lacks the years 1846, 1847, 1855, and 1866, and would be grateful if any reader would send him copies to 96 Crescent Road, Reading. He also needs Vol. I of Wilson's *History of the Dissenting Churches*.

* * *

APPARENTLY even our indispensable Prime Minister sometimes misses the 'bus, even as Homer nodded:

The New Statesman, 13th February.

The story goes round that General Montgomery said to Mr. Churchill, "I drink only water and eat sparingly. I never smoke, and I go to bed at ten. I am a hundred per cent fit". Mr. Churchill replied, "I drink port and I eat a lot; I never leave off smoking, and I go to bed at 3 a.m. I am two hundred per cent fit".

The Times, 2nd March.

Mr. Churchill is making such good progress towards recovery that bulletins are being discontinued.

* * *

LORD COCKBURN said that Sydney Smith, an enormous talker, complained that Macaulay never let him get in a word, and once said to him, "Now, Macaulay, when I am gone, you'll be sorry that you never heard me speak". Once Smith found Macaulay ill in bed, and remarked that he was therefore more agreeable than ever before: "There were some glorious flashes of silence". Which reminds us of the little girl's essay on Quakers:

Quakers are very meek, quiet people who are very quiet and do not answer back. My father is a Quaker, but my mother is not.

* * *

THE son of one of our Moderators, proceeding on his way to an unknown destination, was seated on deck looking out on a glorious evening sky. "You don't get sunsets like that at home, Bill", he remarked to his pal, to get the reply, "No, but give me Rotherham Gasworks in the rain".

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CROSS

A Paper of 1906 by Dr. ROBERT MACKINTOSH,
with Annotations by Dr. P. T. FORSYTH.

Dr. Forsyth's Annotations are in italics within square brackets.

THIS is the third time I have the honour to open a discussion amongst my brethren upon the very weighty matter indicated by the title. It does not seem to me desirable to make use today of my previous materials—whether the first effort, or the second; and this not merely from a dislike of repeating what some of the gathering here have already heard, but from other reasons. There were things I thought it right to say and am glad to have said once, which I should not think it well to repeat. But also, as weeks pass, fresh illustrations and points of view present themselves. Indeed, it would be easy to produce many more than three papers upon such a theme. The circumstances of this gathering were peculiarly interesting because we hoped to have with us Dr. Forsyth. His expected presence constituted the only serious consideration which inclined me to repeat some of my former remarks. For, in the earlier papers, I had allowed myself to criticize him; and one ought not to say behind a man's back what one is not prepared to repeat to his face. As far as that goes, I was quite prepared to repeat my criticisms, whether they are wise or unwise, and to accept the consequences, very stinging though these might have proved. If then I have written a new paper for today, it is not from cowardice, so far as I am conscious, but from a belief that we can make a better use of our short time by breaking what is at least comparatively new ground. How Dr. Forsyth regards me, I do not know and have not inquired. [*I have no feeling but that of extreme respect for Dr. Mackintosh's person and powers. I think it an honour that he should have bestowed so much attention on me and a happiness that he should have appreciated so much of my truth. He has grasped the fact that there is a solidarity in my position, that it does radiate from a centre and cohere in it. And his criticisms, whether I agree with them or not, are perfectly just and such as one student is both free and bound to make on another. I own to an impatience of some of the amateur stuff that passes for criticism in the press and elsewhere—some of it even impertinent. But I wish I could have more of the criticism of those whom I regard with respect as colleagues, both competent in matter, just in spirit, and happy in phrase—like my present critic.*] He may think me an ally, though something of a weakling; or he may bring

down his iron mace on my crown as one of the enemies of Gospel truth. We may learn from him which of these is the case; we hope also to learn far more important things than that.

In the first place, I should like to be allowed to say in presence of some of the younger men, how strongly one sympathizes with their aversion to the forms and phrases of bygone piety. In these days we all, I think, need to begin afresh from the foundation. We all feel that, whatever else our piety or our theology is, it must be moral. One's memory may deceive one; if it may be trusted, there was no such absolute break with traditional beliefs, no such mass of sweeping denials, in one's own past as one hears round about one now. But certainly some have wandered very far afield, and yet have come safely home. I remember a Scottish friend who, on his ordination day, in his sermon, told his horrified Presbytery that men were tired of hearing about justification by faith, and that God was tired of hearing about it too, or if not it was only because He was God and not man. They ordained him! And I think we may fairly say of him that he now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. [*No doubt he came to repent, as well as to regret, his wild and shallow outburst, his degradation of his ministry in mere denunciation instead of explanation. The preacher's business is rescue—to rescue among other things the great phrases, ideas, and theologies from their ignorant perversion. But this is a work that ignorance cannot do.*] That there is a meaning behind the old well-worn phrases—that they stand, however imperfectly, for some of the most sacred things in the Universe—that, above all, Christ's Cross is more profoundly and intensely moral than all other moralities whatsoever—it is this we believe; this we greatly long to see our younger brethren inquiring into, and discovering, and then announcing—not in words learned parrot-like from even the best human teachers and models, but in words forced out of the depths of Christian hearts, and moulded by the touch of God's Holy Spirit.

In the second place, I wish to offer some further contribution towards defining and explaining what Dr. Forsyth's teaching really means—assuming, unless he himself subsequently corrects the statement, that he is rightly regarded as insisting upon the Pauline problem and the Pauline answer.

We have all heard of the formula which states the essence of Protestantism as twofold; there is a formal and a material principle—justification by faith, the authority of Scripture. I think we might define Dr. Forsyth's view of authority by saying that he invites us to regard one principle (justification by faith) as playing both parts. Indeed, how could Protestantism be firmly based if it see-sawed between two authorities? I need not further remind my audience that, with Dr. Forsyth, the question is not merely about

Protestantism but about Christianity. With him, as with the Reformers, faith which justifies is the faith by which a sinner casts his reliance upon the redeeming death of Christ—no less than that, and (perhaps) nothing more. [*Agreed!*]

Or again: Dr. Forsyth's teaching reminds one forcibly at times of the teaching of another brilliant living theologian, Dr. Denney. Both claim considerable—though perhaps not equal—latitude in matters of criticism; both also maintain considerable—though again possibly not equal—rigour in regard to the dogmatic creed. Dr. Denney's book, *The Death of Christ*, in which he tries to show that this one theme is in the foreground of all *N.T.* teaching, seems to me particularly significant. If I understand Dr. Forsyth at all correctly, he must maintain the same thesis. At any rate, Dr. Forsyth might give us a good deal of light as to his own exact locality in the world of thought if he would kindly tell us where precisely he differs from Dr. Denney, and why. [*I have not read Denney with such care as to define my difference exactly. Probably it lies in this penumbra to which Dr. M. alludes. I am sure that in his Studies in Theology he is not as just to Ritschl as he desires to be—for lack of sympathy. But he is more right than wrong.*] We know all about the latter thinker. He is almost painfully clear—a mind without an atmosphere. What he sees, he sees with preternatural vividness. What he does not see, in this blaze of high noon, has no existence at all¹. Dr. Forsyth's mind has different qualities. We might learn to apprehend the Unknown if it were stated to us in terms of the known.

Yet again, it has happened to me during the summer months to read through Harnack's longer *History of Dogma* in its original German. And that has still more strongly impressed on me, what had already frequently been in my thoughts though not I think in my speech—Dr. Forsyth's marked analogy with the Ritschl school. The analogy with this important book is particularly striking. There is more of Augustinianism and of Paulinism in Harnack's *History* than in any of Ritschl's writings; I rather think there is more in the *History* than in some of Harnack's own later publications. [*Hear! Hear!*] At the same time, Harnack has curious resources by means of which he neutralizes his sympathies with the great old theological doctrines. Personally, Harnack is anything but an Augustinian. This suggests a difficulty as to the views of truth which Dr. Forsyth recommends. We are not to understand them by any means as a simple reaction to past modes of thought—but what is the distinction? How far will Dr. Forsyth's teaching carry us? Or what will it leave us?

An objection might be made here. The two comparisons—with

¹ I should be prepared to affirm that Denney mellowed greatly, in subsequent years.—R. M.

Dr. Denney, and with the Harnack of the *History of Dogma*—point in opposite directions. The doubts or fears they suggest cannot in both cases be warranted. That is quite true. Yet, so long as we are uncertain regarding Dr. Forsyth's exact meaning, we do not know which danger to guard against. Or it may prove that one man is impelled by Dr. Forsyth in one direction and another in the opposite direction, neither of them perhaps taking up so well-considered a position as Dr. Forsyth's own. Denney has anchorage, but anchorage (many will say) which we do not like—in the old narrow waters. Harnack's anchor drags, and there is no saying where ships carried about by these currents will end.

In the third place, leaving the direct attempt to throw light upon Dr. Forsyth's views, I proceed not so much to criticize as to put some questions.

Dr. Forsyth's critical freedom shows itself in his commendation of Luther's attitude towards the *Epistle of James*—an epistle of straw, which does not urge Christ upon us. (Exactly the same thing is said by Harnack.) May we ask what we are to infer? Ought *James* to be thrown out of the *N.T.* Canon? [*Only if the standard of the N.T. canon be dogmatic consistency instead of evangelical unity. Nothing strikes me more as I read the N.T. in large sweeps than the incidental position of theology in it combined with its fundamental value. This is due to the pastoral and occasional nature of the writings. Probably the preaching of the Apostles was otherwise—was more theological, without, however, systematic congruity. I think James misunderstood Paul—who in his polemic was easy to misunderstand by a nature ethical without atmosphere, like the Judaistic, British, or working-class mind.*] I venture to think not. And yet I should agree so far as this, that the Epistle, whether or not it is directly criticizing a Pauline train of thought, does not contain Pauline Christianity, and that those who labour to produce a perfect reconciliation between Paul and James labour in vain. [*Hear!*] I will make further admissions. I should be sorry to see any Christian minister today confined to the circle of thoughts represented in *James*. There is no doubt that Paul both rises higher and pierces deeper. And, once more, it is true—as Harnack contends—that the framing of a canon allows the Church to treat doctrines with respect which she is not prepared to advocate remorselessly and without qualification. I concede or I maintain all these points. And yet it may also be maintained that Christianity would be considerably poorer if we had not that simple but searching moral Epistle as part of God's gift to us. If, however, Luther's test is normal—if Paulinism is the touchstone, negatively and positively—then surely the Epistle is of straw and ought to be pitched into the fire. [*No. It is unreconciled with Paul but not irreconcilable.*]

Yet, so far as this carries us, we are on the circumference of Christian life and truth. We approach the centre of things when we turn to the problem of the Synoptic Gospels. I need not remind the audience that, historically, the Gospels have been the books of the Catholic school of piety, if the Pauline epistles have been an inspiration to all the Protestants of every age. Now Catholicism has its manifest blots. To put the case in exaggerated yet hardly false terms—Catholicism when it seeks to be moral is legal, and when it seeks to be religious or spiritual it is superstitious. Its whole life is an oscillation between two standpoints—legal duty, sacramental grace—which are inconsistent [*Are they so inconsistent if you take the Catholic idea of grace not as a moral action of God but as a finer substance infused into human nature as the great quickener and antiseptic? Law and substance, legalism and sacraments, do thus go together.*] with each other, and both of which stand below the level of the Christian revelation. But, in God's providence, we have come to read the Synoptic Gospels with fresh eyes. There is no Catholicism in them. They contain neither legalism nor sacramentarianism. I should think Dr. Forsyth would agree with the view that there are two great formative influences in *N.T.* teaching—the Synoptic teaching of our Lord, and the Pauline doctrine. Everything else in the *N.T.* is derivative from these or secondary in importance. Can it be true that we ought to reduce these two great forces to one? To see nothing in Christ's words except prolegomena to Paulinism? [*My view would be much coloured by the fact which presses its way into me that our Lord himself trusted more to his teaching in the early part of his ministry than at its close, when it failed of the effect he genuinely hoped from it at the outset—namely, the attention and conversion of Israel. If I were not sure to be misunderstood I would say that he became more Pauline—meaning that Paul who failed to respond to Christ as the prophet did seize the true Christ of the consummation. Paul would seem to have had something like a constitutional inability to respond to Christ the parablest or even the character till the Cross broke for him access to Christ's person. I cannot think Paul was ignorant of Christ's words or biography. But they did not find him.*] Christianity as conceived by Christ is summed up for all time, and for all eternity, in the Lord's prayer, which is not legal, not sacramental, nor yet Pauline, but simply Christian. I do not think it paradoxical to hold, what I have ventured to submit in other papers, that this Christianity of Christ's is the true central and dominant standpoint, from which we may make excursions, to James on the left or to Paul on the right, but to which we may ever return again and "fixed in this blissful centre rest". But, be that how it may—whether dominant or not—I do earnestly urge that the Synoptic Gospels must have no minor place in the reverence of

enlightened Christians. I am quite unable to think it anything but a weakness in St. Paul that—except when he quotes Christ as a moral authority—he is indifferent to the earthly life and teaching of the Master. I hold with Weizäcker that the little decaying Church of Jewish disciples gave us a quite priceless legacy, in God's providence, when it bequeathed us the Synoptic Gospels, and that, unless these add their light to that of Paulinism, we have not a healthy Christianity. [*Agreed.*] If on the contrary Paulinism is to be applied as a test, not only *James*, but the Synoptic Gospels, it would seem, must be degraded to second rank. And so Luther implies. [*So I would say, with due qualification. As to the Lord's prayer: 1. It was taught to men in a crude and elementary stage. 2. It is not a prayer so much as a brief scheme or paradigm of prayer—to be filled out. All the Pauline Atonement is in "Hallowed be Thy name". 3. The essential Christian prayer is prayer in Christ's name as in the Fourth Gospel—which is not in the Lord's prayer. 4. Unless we go a step higher and say the Christian prayer is the prayer to Christ which is so undeniable in the N.T. As to the position of the Gospels—they were, like the rest of the N.T., occasional and pastoral, not meant as the foundations of Christianity but as edification, etc., for those in whom Christianity had already been founded. There was something in the preaching of the Apostles which has not the same perspective in the Gospels.*]

In the last place, turning away from our distinguished guest, I am sorely tempted to try to explain myself in view of my last paper. For I was told that I, the elucidator, had been unintelligible. [*You have my deepest sympathy. Haud ignara mali, etc.*] Unfortunately, there are very many reasons to account for that. The limits of time were cruelly narrow; they are no less cruel today. Of course, too, there was something yet more cruel—what is called "the personal equation": I mean, in the speaker. But may I suggest that the personal equation occupies no small space in some of the hearers and the critics, too? If there is in any mind manifest [*and I would add vulgar*] ill will to the very thought of Atonement, what chance has one's explanation of giving satisfaction? [*Hear! Hear!*] The better it explained, the less it would please. Again, if there is in any mind such impatience of obscurity as prefers distinctly understood moral commonplaces to partial glimpses of profound truth, that mind buys clearness at the cost of essential Christianity. I should like to repeat what was said at Lancashire College by Dr. Adeney—that it is one thing to have no theory at all of Atonement, and quite another to have a theory which you confess is and will ever continue incomplete. Also by Professor Peake: that, if his own theory of Atonement explained everything, he should feel sure he had overshot the mark. These

two sayings I hold to be golden² words. The fault of the old theology was that it explained too much. It vulgarized God.

The decisive element in Christian faith, I have ventured to say, is faith in Christ Himself. We begin upon moral lines, with moral teaching, radiating from a moral personality and concentrating there again. Of course we do not mean by this faith merely the belief that a Galilean peasant called Jesus lived 1900 years ago and was executed by the Romans. We do indeed include that in our faith, as against those mystics or idealist philosophers who, with many fine compliments, dissolve the personal Redeemer into an abstract principle, once more betraying the Son of Man—with a kiss. But we mean more than historical recollections. It is not merely that Jesus is one whom we might well have trusted had we lived in Judæa at the Christian era, but that He is one who may be trusted now—who is accessible now [*as a personal continuum*]²—who, as all His apostles testify, is the living Lord. That is the meaning of the Messiahship—the personal faith in which we call Jesus Lord and in which He makes us His free men. Some will call this an addition to the Synoptic teaching; I should call it an elucidation and fuller interpretation. The constant background and undertone of that teaching is the personality of the speaker. What the Gospels sometimes, but only rarely, formulate is now in the foreground or centre of faith. Neither apart, but the teaching *and* the Person—the Person loved, with the teaching obeyed—make us Christians. This loyalty to Christ I take to be the link between the Synoptic discourse and the apostolic doctrine.

Thinking thus of Christ, we come into the presence of His death. It is the facts of Gethsemane and Calvary, more than any authoritative affirmation even by apostles, which convince us that He died for us, and that the sacrifice was needed. Of course, the facts are lighted up by the teaching. Once again, we must not divide but rather unite. And yet I must confess that the Gospel facts have proved themselves the very strongest buttress of my faith; and I feel certain that they are fitted, and designed, to play this part. Is it said, we have no business to learn in this way? First to be Christians, and then to be enlightened as to the redeeming death? Why not? [*Yes, why not? We are made by a Church which taught us to be Christians before we could understand what it meant to be a Christian to the roots.*] May we not learn as Peter and James and John did? We knew and confessed that we were entirely dependent upon Christ; confessing that, might we not still have to learn how much it cost to redeem us? Has anyone learned that fully? If we even begin to learn the lesson, then all the facts of Christ's sufferings become eloquent as to the malignity of sin, and as to the greatness of God's redeeming love.

² Three underlinings by Forsyth.

I ventured to say in a previous paper that we get some light on the mystery when we think of the death of Christ as glorifying God. [*But glorifying God in our sinful humanity—hallowing his name—could only mean acknowledging his holiness in the practical shape of accepting the whole conditions of holiness in a sinful world, which include the penalty that goes with a holy law though not punishment from a holy person.*] In this world of ours, where God had been ignored and disliked and distrusted and defied, the destined sufferer is overheard saying, "O my Father, if this cup may not pass from me except I drink it, Thy will be done". Here then God is known, and loved, and trusted, and served to the uttermost—and is indeed glorified. If we are tempted to brush aside such considerations, does not the temptation prove that, with all our gain in humaneness, we are losing direct and literal godliness? The mind of our Lord was godly.

Yet, while this throws some light into the dark place, it certainly leaves many things in profound obscurity. If it were needful that Christ should die, then His willingness—His reluctant but resolved willingness—glorifies God. But why is it needful? The central point seems to be unexplained. Here is the temptation to go outside moral considerations into a legal region. [*Did not the first necessity of Christ's death lie in God? It was a divine δει. Christ so felt it. He was more engrossed with the will of God than the needs of men in his last hours. Is it legalist in any unworthy sense to recognize the demands of a holy law as imbedded in the divine nature?*] For law by its very nature is definite. [*But is there not the law or structure of a holy personality, not statutory but ethical?*] And we find, in reference to Christ's love for man, no less than in reference to His zeal for God, that the glory and the attractive power of Christ cannot work except upon the admission or assumption that death was necessary. It was matchless love in my friend to plunge into the whirlpool when I was drowning, and bring me ashore. But, if I was safe on the bank, plunging into the rapids in order to show how much he loved me was offensively theatrical. Thus it may plausibly be argued that the moral theory of Atonement itself presupposes a legal theory. [*Yes, legal in the ethical sense but not the forensic. Does the satisfaction of the divine holiness mean only yielding the pound of flesh? Is not the root of the aversion to the word satisfaction the notion of an equivalent penalty instead of an adequate holiness in suffering conditions—the suffering being only the condition not the sacrifice?*] The beautiful tapestries hang upon an unseen peg. It is the tapestries you admire; but, if you knock away the peg, the tapestries fall to the ground. So the loving moral disposition which meets and satisfies our tremendous needs as sinners may be our chief concern; but there is no genuine love in Christ, and hence no moral

glory, apart from the reality of that tremendous need—and you can give your thoughts a sort of brassy clearness not otherwise attainable by calling it a debt to law, a legal necessity. On the other hand, it is perhaps equally true, if less obvious, that we cannot mix our theology out of incoherent elements, half legal half moral, and that *no doctrine is safe which is valued mainly as a peg to hang other doctrines upon.* [No, only as a germ from which they must grow.]

One might put this differently. If it be granted that one element in the Atonement is the glory of God, and that we can so far at least apprehend how God is glorified in Christ's willingness to suffer, then, it may appear, the glory of God is perfectly secured when Christ in Gethsemane yields Himself to the Father's will. [*Gethsemane was not wholly adequate because there the nadir was not touched. The real nadir—the hinge of all—was in the dereliction. The words which follow that show that the ascent had begun. . . . This you go on to recognize, I see.*] Some may recall Frederick Robertson's sermon on the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac. The sacrifice of the will is everything; it is complete, and it is accepted. The sacrifice in act need not, and in that case ought not to, follow. But from our Lord was asked the sacrifice not only of the will but of the deed; not only Gethsemane but Calvary. Once more we ask—Why? We might reply that the antithesis is in a measure false; that even Abraham in the *O.T.* story did not pay the full sacrifice; that in carrying out a hard duty there are features of suffering which not even anguished anticipation can disclose. Gethsemane cost Christ agony, from the sense of God's inflexible will; but Calvary proved to mean a deeper darkness in the sense of God's absence. Still, approximately, in moral essence, the will is everything. Why must the last drops of the cup be wrung out? Was it a penal element that entered there? Did the jurisprudence of heaven insist upon its full pound of flesh? And, as it was impossible that clean flesh could be furnished by the guilty, was it necessary that the pound's weight should be cut out of the innocent? I venture to think not. [*I would say the recognition of God's holiness was not uttermost, was not complete, till the last extremity of suffering experience for a holy soul was reached in the sense of forsakenness. The oblation to God was not complete. I find it hard to think of the climax on the Cross as having but an impressionist purpose for men. Do we not come too near something spectacular? "See how a Christian can die". You remember the Addison story, so helpful if true. And do you fully allow for the final reality of something decisively done in the Cross, done between God and man as the full expression and effect of the totality of Christ's person, and as the eternal crisis of relations between man and God?*] I think it was rather for us that Christ's

death by torture must occur not only in anticipation but in fact; that, in a world so full of sin and misery, He

in the garden secretly
And on the cross on high
Might teach His brethren and inspire
To suffer and to die.

Or rather, surely, might inspire them to cleave to God rather than to life, knowing that God is the life of our life; to cleave to God rather than to happiness, knowing that God's presence is better than happiness, and carries with it, soon or late, a joy unspeakable and full of glory—a joy which such a word as "happiness" is too faint, too weak, to describe.

This, then, it is believed Christ did for us on the cross. Ridiculous assertion, if Jesus was a pathetic visionary, now 1900 years out of date! But a credible saying, and worthy of all acceptance, however surrounded by mystery, if Jesus Christ our Lord, who died for our sins, lives again, in unchanged faithfulness both towards God and towards us, whom He is not ashamed to call His brethren.

[I should like to have gone on to discuss the question of the Cross not merely as the consummation of the Ethical in Humanity—but as the source and authority for it.]

1. *The primacy of the will and conscience.*
2. *Their actual worth in history.*
3. *Their reconstitution in this act (and person) in history.*
4. *The act (and person) therefore as the only source and authority for moral action on the historic and eternal scale, and in individual appropriation.*

If I ventured to say what seems to me absent from this very able and fine essay I should suggest that it is a due allowance for the claims of God's holiness as revealed in Christ's God. God loved His Son better than His prodigal, i.e., His holiness better than His Humanity.]

Note.—Forsyth wrote a subsequent postcard (in which the penultimate sentence is not clear) in which he desires to

add the important point (only implicit in what I have said about holiness) that you give no place in your theory to the idea of judgment. The great day or coming of God (which we see in Christ) is also in O.T. as much a day of judgment as of salvation—the latter by the former. This is not met by saying Christ is judgment on men on they may treat him: but he receives the judgment and thus becomes Judge: "He makes our case his own", John 12³¹.

JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY AND ITS MAKER

By WALTER PARKER.

Its Compilation.

ONE is somewhat apt to consider this monumental work as that of a pious and not over-clean scholar, much given to talk and tea, and perhaps too fond of abusing his fellow-men.

The Dictionary was the outcome of the strenuous labours of an "obscure young man"—to quote Dr. Burney, Fanny's father—"who single handed and alone, began it when he was little more than 36 years of age; that he had completed it before he received any degree from any university; that he kept back the title-page until the authorities at Oxford had time to confer upon him a small degree, that of Master of Arts; that it was many years later that finally and forever he became 'Dr. Johnson'".

Robert Dodsley, the publisher, suggested that Johnson should undertake the work, but Johnson told Boswell that he had long thought of it himself. Andrew Millar, another publisher associated with Dodsley and others, arranged that Johnson should receive £1,575 for the completed work, out of which he was to pay his six assistants! It was not much, but he was easily satisfied in money matters. To a friend who pointed out that it took the French Academy, which consisted of 40 members, 40 years to compile its dictionary, Johnson replied: "This, then, is the proportion: 40 times 40 is 1,600; as 3 is to 1,600 so is the proportion of an Englishman to a Frenchman". Actually it took seven years! Johnson began his labours in Holborn, but soon took a large house in Gough Square, off Fleet Street, in the garret of which he carried to completion his great work.

It is strange that Johnson, who always affected to dislike Scotland and Scotsmen, had practically all Scotch people to help with his Dictionary: 5 of his 6 amanuenses were Scotch, so was his chief publisher and his printer! His publisher, Millar, was sadly tried by Johnson's lack of business punctuality and exclaimed when the last sheet was brought to him: "Thank God I have done with him". On being told this, the lexicographer remarked with a smile: "I am glad that he thanks God for anything".

In 1747, eight years before the publication of the Dictionary, Johnson had issued *A Plan of a Dictionary*, addressed to the Earl of Chesterfield, author of the famous *Letters to his son*. The latter took no interest in either the Dictionary or its editor until Dodsley, the publisher, informed him that the work was on the eve of publication, and reminded his lordship that the *Plan* had been

addressed to him. Then Chesterfield, desirous of participating in the glory of the issue of the great compilation, wrote two letters to *The World*, both fulsome in their flattery. In one he wrote: "In times of confusion we must choose a Dictator. I give my vote for Mr. Johnson and I hereby declare that I make a total surrender of all my rights and privileges in the English language as a free-born British subject, to the said Mr. Johnson during the term of his dictatorship. Nay more, I will not only obey him, but like an old Roman, as my Dictator, but like a modern Roman, I will implicitly believe in him as my Pope, and hold him to be infallible". This eulogistic statement did not affect Johnson in the slightest, for he had not forgotten his former neglect at the noble lord's hands, so said: "After making great professions he had, for many years taken no notice of me, but when my Dictionary was coming out he fell to scribbling in *The World* about it". The worthy Doctor then took up his pen and wrote what was possibly the most devastating and belittling letter in all literature, and this he inserted as a Foreword to his Dictionary! The letter is too well-known to need repetition here; Carlyle referred to it as "a blast of doom, proclaiming into the ears of Lord Chesterfield and through him to the listening world, that patronage should be no more".

When the great work was issued to the public on February 20th, 1755, its editor was very depressed and had, he said: "Devoted the labour of years to the honour of my country that we may no longer yield the palm of philology without a contest to the nations of the continent", and added, "I have protracted my work till most of those I wished to please have sunk into the grave, and success and miscarriage are empty sounds: I therefore dismiss the book with frigid tranquility—having little to fear or hope from censure or from praise".

The Dictionary Itself.

What a wonderful book it is, especially considering the circumstances in which it was written: Johnson was half-blind, full of complaints, seldom free from pain; yet the indomitable courage of the man kept him going for seven long years at his wearisome task. It was written, as he says, "With little assistance of the learned; without any patronage of the great; not in the soft obscurities of retirement, or under academic bowers, but amidst inconvenience and distraction, in sickness and in sorrow".

Buckle the historian, and Browning the poet, read it right through to improve their vocabulary! For the first time appeared quotations from great authors to illustrate words Johnson defined; in preparation for which task he thoroughly applied himself to diligent reading, underscoring with a pencil selections to be copied

out by his assistants: his marvellous memory stood him in good stead, while the range of his reading was boundless. Yet he spoke of and thought himself lazy. Entering Mrs. Thrale's drawing-room one day and seeing her dog asleep before the fire, he said: "Presto, you are if possible, a lazier dog than I am".

Consider the modesty of the man in a note to his friend Dr. Burney: "When you have looked into my Dictionary, if you find faults I shall endeavour to mend them; if you find none I shall think you blinded by kind partiality". Again to the same friend he wrote soon after the publication of the Dictionary: "Yours is the only letter of goodwill that I have yet received, though indeed I am promised something of that sort from Sweden".

Slowly the Dictionary became popular, then a "best-seller", and as such it continued for nearly a century. "What I like about your Dictionary, Mr. Johnson", said one old lady, "is that it has no naughty words in it". "Madam", boomed its compiler, "I hope you have not been looking for them". To another who remarked that for steady reading it changed the subject pretty often, Johnson admitted that it had that common fault of many dictionaries! To a lady who complained that the "ocean" had been omitted, the great man patiently replied: "Madam, you will look for it in vain if you spell it O-s-h-u-n".

Some Definitions.

Let us pick out a few definitions of striking originality.

Favourite. "A mean wretch whose whole business is by any means to please".

A Lexicographer is "a writer of dictionaries; a harmless urdge that busies himself in tracing the original and detailing the significance of words". Thus Johnson was not averse to making fun of himself as well as others.

Oats, a famous definition: "A grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people". "Very true", was Lord Elibank's retort, "and where will you find such men and such horses!"

A poetess is a "she-poet".

In the portion of his Dictionary "Grammar of the English tongue" Johnson made a serious error where he states: "H seldom, perhaps never, begins any but the first syllable". Wilkes, the dissolute M.P. and journalist, pounced on this with the sarcastic remark: "The author of this observation must be a man of quick apprehension and of a most comprehensive genius". At the time Johnson let the gibe pass, but in the 4th edition of the Dictionary he replied to Wilkes thus: "It sometimes begins middle or final syllables of words compounded, as block-head".

Opinions of the Dictionary and its Maker.

Said Carlyle: "Had Johnson left nothing but his Dictionary, one might have traced there a great intellect, a genuine man. Looking to its clearness of definition, its genuine solidity, honesty, insight and successful method, it may be called the best of all dictionaries. There is a kind of architectural nobleness: it stands like a great solid square-built edifice, finished: symmetrically complete; you judge that a true Builder did it".

Austin Dobson, the writer of charming essays and dainty poems, wrote thus of Johnson:

Turn now to his Writings. I grant in his tales,
That he made little fishes talk vastly like whales;
I grant that his language was rather emphatic,
Nay, even—to put the thing plainly—dogmatic;
But read him for style—and dismiss from your thoughts,
The crowd of compilers who copied his faults,
Say, where is there English so full and so clear,
So weighty, so dignified, manly, sincere?
So strong in expression, conviction, persuasion?
So prompt to take colour from place and occasion?
So widely remov'd from the doubtful, the tentative;
So truly and in the best sense argumentative?
You may talk of your Burkes and your Gibbons so clever,
But I hark back to him with a "Johnson for ever!"
And I feel as I muse on his ponderous figure,
Tho' he's great in this age, in the next he'll grow bigger.

THE OTHER LEFT.

Few words were needed when the Master spoke,
Of words was He the master—as of man—
A turn, a phrase, the image straight took shape,
As moulded by His hand. A tale thus ran:
Two women grinding daily at the mill,
The one is taken and the other left.
Their common task, the homely scene portrayed,
A sudden blow, the other lone, bereft.
The tale how simple, soon the story told,
But dire the desolation, drear and deep.
I oft had read those lines, but knew them not
Until my second self passed on in sleep.

J. LLOYD.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MODERN MISSIONARY MOVEMENT

By the Rev. E. A. PAYNE, B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

I. MANY branches of the Christian Church are about to celebrate important missionary anniversaries. During the thirty-two years from 1792 to 1824 almost all the great modern Missionary Societies of Britain, the Continent of Europe, and America (with the exception of the China Inland Mission) had their origin, and the completion of a century and a half of work would in any case have led to a retelling of the story of their beginnings and an attempt to assess the achievements of 150 years.

The most casual acquaintance with the situation of Britain and Europe at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century brings to the mind two very suggestive and important facts which greatly increase the relevance and value of these matters. First, the birth of the modern missionary movement coincided, strange as it at first seems, with a time of revolution, war, and social upheaval. Second, it followed, was a sequel to or reaction from, a time of spiritual deadness, when Christianity had been sadly in eclipse both in intellectual circles and in everyday life.

In his stimulating Penguin book, *Christianity and Social Order*, the Archbishop of Canterbury has a somewhat curious paragraph¹ on the eighteenth century. He suggests that the Church then confined itself almost entirely to theology and piety, which are at all times fundamental to it. "What happened", he writes,

was a retirement, so to speak, upon the central citadel. Wearied with the controversies of the sixteenth century, distraught by the religious wars of the seventeenth (of which our Civil War was one), men fell back in their religious life upon what is most central and fundamental. The spirit of man needed to recuperate; but having regained freshness it sallied forth again, under the inspiration of its central faith, in the Methodist movement, the Tractarian revival and the Christian social enterprise.

Now, acute as were some of those who argued with the Deists and great as was the Non-Juring tradition of piety in the Church of England (and I take it that these are things which Dr. Temple has in mind), his picture is surely a dangerous simplification, indeed idealization, of the position of organized religion. Professor Latourette is more honest, more explicit, and more convincing. In

¹ P. 24.

the third volume of his remarkable survey of the expansion of Christianity he notes four major threats to Christianity, which were cumulative and reached their height in the closing years of the eighteenth century.

Latourette has in mind both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, and he notes (1) the loss of vigour in Spain and Portugal, the countries which had been chiefly responsible for such expansion of Christianity as had taken place during the preceding centuries; (2) the expulsion from Portuguese, Spanish, and French territories of the Society of Jesus, and then the dissolution of the Order by the Pope; (3) the growing religious apathy and scepticism, showing themselves in a rationalism often actively hostile to the Christian Church, and in a numbing of conviction and cooling of enthusiasm within the ranks of its members; and (4) social and political upheavals in Europe, and in the overseas possessions of European powers, which seriously interrupted, if they did not actually prevent, the customary activities of the Church, and to which must be added severe and insistent persecutions of such Christian groups as existed in Eastern Asia². The third and fourth of these points specially concern us, and they give a truer picture of the situation than the much milder description of the Archbishop. To many acute and sympathetic observers towards the close of the eighteenth century the prospect for the Church seemed indeed bleak.

Then, suddenly, came an uprush of new life, and Christianity entered upon a period of new influence and of unprecedented expansion. The fresh vigour showed itself both in Roman Catholicism and in Protestantism, but in the latter first. In Latourette's eloquent words³:

So great was the rising tide of life in Protestantism that it did not wait for the re-establishment of peace to undertake measures for the extension of the faith. In a crumbling world and in the face of widespread religious scepticism, earnest minorities within Protestantism were already building for a new day. While the French Revolution was destroying the old order in Europe, impelled by their Christian purpose, humble men and women were initiating movements which were to disseminate their faith more widely than even the ideals of the French Revolution were carried.

Our own situation is so similar to that facing men then, both as regards outward conflict and inner loss of spiritual power, that there would clearly be a good case for the study of the beginnings of the missionary movement even were there no special anniversaries to provoke our attention. Here was something bringing new life to the Church, spreading, through all its branches, and drawing them closer together than they had been since the Reformation,

² *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, III. 454-6.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. 65.

showing itself in a time of war and revolution, and having such widespread and far-reaching results. What was it that happened towards the close of the eighteenth century? How did it happen?

But, first, is it any good studying such things? Are not such movements simply in the hands of God, whose times and seasons are beyond our understanding or compelling? Is it not enough to call it "an upsurging, creative impulse within Christianity itself"⁴, and to hope somewhat wistfully that there may come in our time some similar renewal, and, if not, to endure as best we can? "The wind bloweth where it listeth", it is true, but Church history makes clear that the life-giving wind is much more constant and prevailing than man's readiness to breathe it, or his resolute hoisting of his sail that he may be carried along by its power. Elusive as spiritual origins are, something of the ancestry of the modern missionary movement may be made out, and it has in it many interesting and challenging stages.

The modern missionary movement is usually described, in rough and ready fashion, as one of the products of the Evangelical Revival⁵. Whether a main product or a by-product has depended on the interest and knowledge of the person making the statement. On the whole, until recently, it has been regarded as a rather subsidiary and specialized interest springing from the quickening of religious life in the Revival. We may not unfairly take Dr. J. Wesley Bready's *England: Before and After Wesley* as typical. In one place he gives a paragraph to the Protestant "'world movement' with its great succession of foreign missionary societies", calling it "a lineal descendant of the Evangelical Revival"⁶. Elsewhere⁷ he claims that "Protestant Foreign Missions" were both "founded and established" by the Revival, though the following sentence shows that he is somewhat patronizing and critical:

This Movement has made mistakes [he does not specify what they are]: but, taken for all in all, it has represented, perhaps (*sic*), the most humane and most soulful of all the impacts of the West upon the East.

Those who know Dr. Bready's book will recall that for the author, as for many less learned and able than he, the Evangelical Revival and John Wesley are synonymous. The Revival was, to use his own words, "an epochal movement, of which Wesley was the master-figure", and wide as is the field of Dr. Bready's researches, he always finds before long a way back to his hero.

No one would wish to belittle Wesley and his work, but in regard to missionary origins his is certainly not the only name to

⁴ *Op. cit.*, IV. 22.

⁵ Cf. A. W. Harrison, *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*, 177: "It may fairly be claimed that the modern missionary movement sprang directly out of the eighteenth century Revival".

⁶ P. 307.

⁷ Pp. 373-8.

be considered, nor indeed the chief name, and the term "Evangelical Revival" must be interpreted far more widely than it usually is, if it is adequately to cover the impulses which led to the modern missionary movement. We have to go back, not to the Epworth Rectory where John Wesley was born on June 28, 1703, but to a home in Connecticut, New England, where on October 5 of that same year, Jonathan Edwards saw the light. The decisive influence of Edwards on the new life which carried the Church out to distant continents seems to have been all too little recognized by those who have written about the origin of the missionary movement.

II. The English Baptists are generally accorded the distinction of being the first in modern times to found a society deliberately and exclusively aimed at the evangelization of the non-Christian world, and there is no doubt at all about the important repercussions which their action had in other branches of the Church. The founders of the London Missionary Society and the Church Missionary Society, and those who sought to awaken the conscience of the Church of Scotland in regard to world-evangelization, confessed that they had been challenged and inspired by what the Baptists had done. When, in October, 1792, a little group of Midland Baptist ministers formed the Baptist Missionary Society, they did a new thing, and one of tremendous consequence. Theirs is a remarkable story.

The little company were hardly any of them known outside their own very restricted spheres. They stood barely on the fringe of the main intellectual and religious influences of the time. They were most of them young men. They were led to the step they took by the importunity of William Carey, shoemaker, schoolmaster, pastor, who, in 1792, was 31 years old. Not without difficulty he had won for his scheme the support of Andrew Fuller, a sturdy, self-educated son of the Fens, seven years his senior. Carey and Fuller were the leaders of the enterprise. Sutcliff, of Olney, and Ryland, of Northampton, were their close friends, and, from 1792, staunch collaborators in the cause. These men were not under the influence of John Wesley. Far from it. For long the Wesleyan Revival was regarded in Baptist, as in other circles, with much suspicion⁸. As late as 1809 a Baptist as shrewd and

⁸ Cf. A. W. Harrison, *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*, 129: "John Wesley, in spite of his Nonconformist ancestry, had a distinct dislike for Dissent and was particularly out of favour with Baptists and Quakers". *Ibid.*, 177, claims that "even Carey, who is often called the father of modern missions, owed much to the Evangelical Revival", but the only evidence offered are the casual contacts between Carey and young Thomas Scott between 1779 and 1785 and the use of the words "societies" and "connexion" in the Northampton Prayer Call of 1784. Dr. Harrison is surely quite wrong in tracing in the latter the influence of Wesley and his Methodist preachers.

cultured as John Foster, the essayist, could write of Methodism as "that odious and ill-defined mischief". Carey felt himself rebuked and challenged by the example of the Moravians, but so did he by that of the Pietists and by that of Catholics like Xavier. He was stirred by the discoveries of Captain Cook. But, next to the Bible, the really dominating influence on the thinking and practice of Carey and his friends was Jonathan Edwards (1703-58).

It was a threefold influence, theological, devotional, and practical. (1) There was a theological influence, affecting Fuller and Ryland most of all. These men had grown up in an atmosphere of high, or hyper, Calvinism, and it was stifling the life of their churches. Gill and Brine were the chief teachers of the day in Baptist circles. "They were", says a historian who grew up near enough to them to interpret their attitude with understanding⁹,

Supralapsarians, holding that God's election was irrespective of the fall of man. They taught eternal justification. . . . Although they themselves inculcated practical godliness, and so were not justly liable to the charge of Antinomianism, there is reason to fear that numbers of those who imbibed their doctrinal views kept out of sight, or but feebly urged, the obligation of believers to personal holiness. . . . They were satisfied with stating men's danger and assuring them that they were on the high road to perdition. But they did not call upon them to "repent and believe the gospel" . . . And the churches did not, could not, under their instruction, engage in efforts for the conversion of souls.

Young Fuller, seeking to work out a more satisfying and satisfactory theology, on the basis of his own religious experience, found in Jonathan Edwards a teacher who spoke powerfully to his mind and heart. Edwards maintained the distinctive principles of classic Calvinism—the sovereignty and majesty of God, and divine decrees—but gave a certain freedom to the will of man, emphasized the mercy and love of God, and so presented the gospel that unrepenting men were left without excuse for its rejection. He expounded his views with great acuteness and power, and from 1777 onwards Fuller was a close student of his works. Fuller's own book, *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (written by 1781, and published in 1784)—an epoch-making, life-giving book so far as Baptists were concerned, clearing the path for evangelism both at home and abroad—was substantially the same in outlook as the more famous treatises of the New England divine¹⁰.

⁹ J. M. Cramp, *Baptist History*, 435.

¹⁰ Cf. Fuller's farewell letter to Ryland, dictated April 28, 1815; "We have some, who have been giving out of late, that if Sutcliff and some others had preached more of Christ, and less of Jonathan Edwards, they would have been more useful! If those who talk thus, preached Christ half as much as Jonathan Edwards did, and were half as useful as he was, their usefulness would be double what it is. It is very singular that the Mission to the East should have originated with men of these

(2) There was the challenge which came to those Midland Baptists from the quickening of life in the New England churches which is now generally called "The Great Awakening", and this was powerfully supplemented by the plea put forward by Edwards in his *Humble Attempt to promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's people in Extraordinary Prayer* (1749). It was this last-named book which prompted Sutcliff to organize a Call to Prayer throughout the Northampton Baptist Association. All are agreed on the decisive importance of this prayer movement in relation to the founding of the B.M.S., and later the L.M.S.

(3) And not least important, Carey, who had benefited by both the theological and the prayer impulses, was himself deeply stirred by Edwards's edition of the diary and journal of David Brainerd, the saintly young missionary of the American Indians. It was, as Ryland put it, "almost a second Bible to him". Brainerd became Carey's hero, and with increasing conviction and persistence, he pleaded for the starting of a missionary society. Nor could he forget that Edwards himself had worked among the Indians during his years at Stockbridge and while he was writing his most important theological work.

This will be seen to be a very rich and powerful threefold influence. Edwards is described¹¹ by B. B. Warfield as "saint and metaphysician, revivalist and theologian . . . the one figure of real greatness in the intellectual life of colonial America". Latourette¹² calls him "one of the ablest minds of the century". G. P. Fisher¹³, in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, does not hesitate to name him in the same sentence as Augustine, Anselm, and Aquinas. But none of them draws attention to what is certainly not the least of his claims on the gratitude of posterity—the influence he exerted on the little group of Baptists in "midmost England", and so on the modern worldwide Church. If further confirmation is wanted of the warm regard and deep respect in which these Baptists held Edwards, it may be found in the fact that Ryland gave to one of his sons the names David Brainerd and to another the names Jonathan Edwards.

Now there is little doubt that the interest of the Northamptonshire group in Edwards was fed, and perhaps in large measure kindled, by a Scot—by Dr. John Erskine (?1721-1803), of Edinburgh, who on several counts deserves honour. I cannot at

(Calvinistic) principles; and without pretending to be a prophet, I may say, if ever it falls into the hands of men who talk in this strain it will come to nothing". (Ryland, *Memoirs of Fuller*, 1816, 545-6). Fuller distinguished three sorts of Calvinists—the high (= hyper), the moderate (= Baxterians, or half Arminians), and the strict ("One that really holds the system of Calvin. I do not believe everything that Calvin taught, nor anything because he taught it; but I reckon strict Calvinism to be my own system"). Cf. Ryland, 566-7.

¹¹ *E.R.E.*, V. 221.

¹² *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, III. 215.

¹³ P. 395.

present discover when and how Erskine and the Northamptonshire Baptists came into contact. Ryland says that he kept up a frequent correspondence with him from 1780 until Erskine's death in 1803¹⁴. In 1780 Ryland was a young man of 26 about to become co-pastor in Northampton with his rugged old father; Erskine was nearly 60. In 1781 a youthful Baptist of 17 called on Erskine on his way north to a brilliant career at Aberdeen University. The letters of introduction he had were perhaps written by Ryland. The youth was named Robert Hall, and he was destined to become the outstanding preacher of his day. For many years afterwards, we are told¹⁵, he

used often to speak of the affectionate attentions of Dr. Erskine, on this occasion; and of his own feelings, when, on taking leave, the venerable man of God exhorted him to self-vigilance, kissed him, laid his hand upon his head, blessing him and commending him to the watchful care of the great Head of the Church.

Venerable he perhaps appeared to young Robert Hall, but Erskine had more than another twenty years of vigorous life, and in those two decades did some of his greatest service.

From 1780 onwards it was Erskine's habit to send parcels of books to Ryland. In one of the bundles was a volume of Dutch sermons, which furnished the occasion for Ryland's testing Carey's remarkable linguistic powers¹⁶. Then, in April, 1784, Erskine sent Edwards's *Humble Attempt*, containing the plea for concerted prayer; Ryland passed it on to Sutcliff, and it led the latter to initiate the famous Prayer Call of 1784. All his life Erskine delighted in contacts and correspondence with those of other countries and other churches, but he can have had little idea of what would follow from the parcels he sent south to Northamptonshire.

What was Erskine's relationship to Jonathan Edwards? Erskine had chosen the Christian ministry when his family wanted him to be a lawyer. He had been a student at the time of the famous Cambuslang revival, which occurred just two hundred years ago. This was an apparently quite unexpected outbreak of religious fervour, which was quickly and vigorously stimulated by young Whitefield, who arrived in Scotland on his first visit shortly after it had begun. Not a few Church of Scotland ministers strongly objected to Whitefield's itinerant methods, but young Erskine became his champion, and published an anonymous pamphlet cautiously hinting that perhaps the Cambuslang revival, and other stirrings of which he had heard, might be the beginning of the latter-day glory. He delighted in Whitefield's Calvinism,

¹⁴ *Memoirs of Fuller*, 262.

¹⁵ Olinthus Gregory, *Memoir of Robert Hall*, 14-15.

¹⁶ Ryland, *Memoirs of Fuller*, 240n.

but strongly disapproved of what he heard of John Wesley. Within a few years of settling in his first charge at Kirkintilloch, under the influence of his friend, John Maclaurin, of Glasgow, Erskine began to correspond with Jonathan Edwards and a number of other New England ministers, exchanging with them books and information. He became an ardent champion of the colonists, and made vigorous appeals for conciliation at the time of the disputes which led to the War of Independence. The news of the Great Awakening deeply stirred him, and when, in 1750, Jonathan Edwards was dismissed from his church—the trouble, it will be remembered, turned on questions of discipline—Erskine and Maclaurin sent him financial help, and even suggested that he seek a charge in Scotland. But Edwards had a wife and nine children, and hesitated to bring them across the Atlantic. Erskine had to content himself with circulating his friend's books, of several of which he prepared special editions.

He was ever eager to encourage evangelistic and missionary work, being far ahead of his time in this respect¹⁷. He must have rejoiced to hear what his Baptist friends ventured upon in 1792, even if he did not know the part he had himself played in it. When, in 1796, a motion in favour of foreign missions came before the General Assembly, it was Erskine who, roused by the opposition it provoked, uttered the famous cry, "Moderator, rax me that Bible!" He was then 75, and the defeat of the motion greatly disappointed him. Three years later Andrew Fuller and John Sutcliff, on their first visit to Scotland, were able to call on him. "An excellent old man", was Fuller's comment. "Dr. Erskine is all and more than all, that expectation could have depicted him"¹⁸. And another strong link between Scotland and the B.M.S. was then formed. One of Erskine's daughters had married Dr. Charles Stuart, of Dunearn¹⁹, who became a most staunch friend of Fuller and of the Baptist missionaries, and who was also the link between the latter and the great Thomas Chalmers.

Here we come upon another very significant figure in the story of modern missionary beginnings, as, of course, in much else. "I have a distinct impression", wrote James Denney once of Thomas Chalmers, "that he is our greatest man since Knox, and greater than all his works. He had the greatness of the nation in him as

¹⁷ At the close of their historic tour of Scotland, Johnson spent a few days in Edinburgh at the home of his friend Boswell. It was in 1773; note the date. One evening John Erskine was invited to supper. Here is the passage from the *Journal*: "Dr. Erskine and Mr. Robert Walker, two very respectable ministers of Edinburgh, supped with us, as did the Reverend Dr. Webster. The conversation turned on the Moravian missions, and on the Methodists. Dr. Johnson observed in general, that missionaries were too sanguine in their accounts of their success among savages, and that much of what they tell is not to be believed". (Oxford edition, 425). What did Erskine reply?

¹⁸ Ryland, *Memoirs*, 381.

¹⁹ Hanna, *Memoirs of Thomas Chalmers*, I. 370n.

well as that of the Church''²⁰. Certainly he played a decisive part in awakening Scotland to her missionary task, and it is suggestive for our present purposes that three major influences leading up to the spiritual crisis which made Chalmers an "Evangelical" were the writings of Jonathan Edwards, Wilberforce's *Practical Christianity*, and the early reports of the Baptist Missionary Society. The story of the change is well known. He read Edwards avidly at the age of sixteen, but soon after drifted away from the Calvinistic standpoint. Then as a brilliant young minister, with wide interests, particularly in natural science and in economics, he undertook to write an encyclopædia article on Christianity. Shortly before Sydney Smith had begun his notorious attacks on the Serampore missionaries in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*. While Chalmers was engaged upon the article, he was taken seriously ill, and during his convalescence was led to modify his views on the essentials of Christianity. A prime cause was undoubtedly Wilberforce's impressive personal testimony. Chalmers wrote in 1820 on the effect on him of Wilberforce's book²¹:

I am now most thoroughly of opinion, and it is an opinion founded on experience, that on the system of—Do this and live, no peace, and even no true and worthy obedience can ever be attained. It is, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. When this belief enters the heart, joy and confidence enter along with it.

And later (1825)²²:

The deep views he (Wilberforce) gives of the depravity of our nature, of our need of an atonement, of the great doctrine of acceptance through atonement, of the sanctifying influences of the Spirit—these all give a new aspect to a man's religion.

During the latter part of 1811 there are a number of allusions in Chalmers's journal to the work of the Baptist Missionaries in India. Three months later occurred the great fire at Serampore, and he took a public part in raising money to replace some of their losses²³. In March, 1813, he notes²⁴:

Got a parcel from Dr. Stuart, and gave myself to the Baptist Report, to the exclusion of my evening devotion.

A month later he was organizing a petition to secure the rights of missionaries in the new Charter of the East India Company which was before Parliament. In August of the same year he and Andrew Fuller met.

²⁰ *Letters of James Denney to Robertson Nicoll*, 123.

²¹ Hanna, *op. cit.* I. 186.

²² *Ibid.*, I. 186-7. Hanna compares and contrasts the "conversion" of Loyola and Luther with that of Chalmers: the first devotional, the second legal, the third moral and social.

²³ Cf. *Sermon at Dundee*, Oct. 26, 1812, afterwards printed and widely circulated.

²⁴ Hanna, I. 323.

The latter was on his fifth and last visit to Scotland, only 59 years old, but in failing health, worn out by his labours for the B.M.S. Chalmers was 33. He went to hear Fuller preach at Dundee and Cupar, and had him to stay two nights in his manse at Kilmany. His comments are illuminating²⁵:

Aug. 6, 1813: Rose early this morning to enjoy the conversation of Mr. Fuller. The party left me for New Inn. I accompanied them in the chaise, and got out at Letham, and returned to Kilmany in the afternoon. I have much to gather from the last three days: (1) I am still ashamed of the testimony of Christ, and would have felt this had I walked the streets of Cupar with the missionaries—O my God, forgive and cleanse. (2) But still the slave of men, and ambitious of their testimony. Was it incumbent on me to go both to Dundee and Cupar? Why think my presence of so much importance? Cannot I labour in my own sphere, and leave it to others to labour in theirs? (3) God was very kind in conducting this affair to so pleasurable a termination: a most comfortable meeting with these people, and Mr. Fuller's conversation, in particular, has left an impulse behind it. Let me henceforth attempt to extemporize from the pulpit; let me decline all extra engagements; let me redeem time, and give a steady and systematic direction to my efforts—O my God, may I henceforth maintain a more decided tone of piety to Thee, and of usefulness to Thy Cause.

For Fuller thus to have impressed Chalmers was a tribute to both men. As they rode away Fuller said to one of his friends²⁶:

If that man would but throw away his papers in the pulpit, he might be King of Scotland.

About the use of manuscript he was wrong. Chalmers was never able effectively to extemporize. But Fuller had discerned the great gifts of the younger man and wrote to him afterwards of "the importance that may attach to a single mind receiving an evangelical impression"²⁷. There can be no doubt that the influence of this meeting is to be traced in Chalmers's increasing missionary interest, in the part he played in securing the setting up of the Foreign Missions Committee of the Church of Scotland, and in his encouragement of Alexander Duff. Baptists paid some of their deep debt to Erskine and to Scotland in helping to quicken Thomas Chalmers, in stimulating missionary interest in the Secession and Relief Churches, in their influence on the Haldanes, and in other less obvious ways. But to trace these things would carry us too far afield.

III. Enough has been said to make clear the spiritual genealogy of certain of the chief figures in the beginnings of the modern

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I. 335-6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 338.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 337.

missionary movement. We pass from Jonathan Edwards, by way of Erskine, to the Northamptonshire Baptists; from them we can trace at any rate one line back to Thomas Chalmers. Throughout it is an evangelicalism with a strong Calvinistic strain.

The same general outlook may be traced in other contemporary groups of missionary pioneers. The London Missionary Society was the product of several converging streams, and was from the first on a broad, interdenominational basis, uniting evangelical Anglicans, Independents, and Presbyterians²⁸. Thomas Haweis was an important figure, for many years rector of Aldwinkle, in Northamptonshire, and well known to most of the more famous religious leaders of his day. It was Whitefield who encouraged his early zeal; contact with Samson Occom, an Indian from America, which quickened his missionary interest; and close association with the Countess of Huntingdon which gave him his chief opportunities of sharing in evangelistic enterprises abroad. George Burder and the Warwickshire Independents, who played an essential part in the formation of the L.M.S., owed their inspiration directly to Carey and the Northamptonshire Baptists. So did those who moved in Bristol, and it was there that the Scotsman, David Bogue, was drawn into the movement. With him are to be named a whole group of Scottish ministers, who were preachers at the time in London, and who played a distinguished part in the early history of the L.M.S.—Robert Steven, of the Scots Church, Covent Garden; Alexander Waugh, of the Secession Church in Wells Street; and, most important of all, John Love, of Spitalfields, the first secretary of the L.M.S., later, on his return to Scotland, secretary of the Glasgow Missionary Society, and the man whose name is finely preserved in Lovedale, Kaffraria. It was Waugh who is said to have drafted “the fundamental principle” of the L.M.S., the declaration that it does not aim at sending abroad any particular type of church order or government but “the glorious gospel of the blessed God”²⁹. But the historian of the L.M.S. states categorically that almost all the first generation of L.M.S. missionaries would have had no difficulty whatever in signing the full Westminster Confession³⁰.

Of the Anglicans who started the Church Missionary Society in 1799, Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, was outstanding, and with him were associated the Venns, father and son, rugged old John Newton, Thomas Scott, the commentator, and the Clapham Sect, that group of able administrators and philanthropists, with Wilberforce as their brilliant centre, who did so much to quicken the conscience of England, not only in regard to slavery, but in matters

²⁸ Cf. Payne, *Before the Start: Steps towards the Founding of the L.M.S.*

²⁹ Hay and Belfrage, *Memoir of Alexander Waugh*, 207.

³⁰ Lovett, *History of the L.M.S.*, I. 48.

of education, poverty, vice, and industrial conditions. Again it is a group who were consciously Calvinist in theology. Simeon, like Chalmers a few years later, was a close student of the Periodical Accounts of the B.M.S. When 36 years old, he paid a visit to Scotland, which deeply impressed him, and it is interesting to find him listening to old Dr. Erskine, in Edinburgh. "His appearance and zeal reminded me much of my dear friend Mr. Venn", wrote Simeon. Three days later he dined with Erskine³¹:

Never was there a more friendly warm-hearted man than Dr. E., nor have I often spent a more pleasant or profitable season. A perfect freedom from bigotry, and a Christian cheerfulness seemed to pervade the whole company. Oh that I might get more good, and do more good while I enjoy the privilege of access to such a company!

Enough has been said to substantiate the claim that the Evangelical Revival, if it is to be called the source of the modern missionary movement, must be conceived far more widely than in terms of Wesley and the notable work he did. Thomas Coke, the eccentric, restless, brilliant "foreign minister of methodism" was undoubtedly a product of, as well as an outstanding contributor to, the Methodist Revival, and his influence spread to many outside Methodism; but, in the main, it is clear that it was Whitefield with whom the British missionary leaders had far closer sympathy.

And with Whitefield one is back beside Jonathan Edwards. Whether Whitefield ever fully understood Calvinism may be doubted. Theological thinking was not his *forte*³². Whether or not he put forward Calvinistic views before his first visit to America in 1739 is not exactly clear. If he did, it was probably under the influence of some Scottish sermons³³. Tyerman sums up the matter³⁴:

Whitefield's Calvinism was suddenly born in England, about the month of June, 1739; but it was cradled and greatly strengthened in America, during the year 1740.

It was then he first met Jonathan Edwards, heard and saw something of the beginnings of the Great Awakening, which had first shown itself in 1735, and which, therefore, antedates all the revival movements in this country. Whitefield helped to fan its flames into a swiftly spreading fire. He was then 24, just discovering his mighty powers as a preacher. He found Edwards, who was eleven years his senior, "a solid, excellent Christian"³⁵, but is said to have "winced a little under his metaphysical probe". Edwards, on his

³¹ *Memoirs of Simeon*, 115, 117.

³² On Sunday, August 15, 1773, before setting out on his Scottish tour, Johnson while in Edinburgh with Boswell was drawn into conversation about Whitefield with whom he had been at College. He charged him with having "a mind like a hammer". (Oxford ed., 181).

³³ Tyerman, *Life of Whitefield*, I. 274.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*, I. 427.

part, was deeply moved by Whitefield's preaching. "His sermons", he wrote,

were suitable to the circumstances of the town; containing just reproofs of our backslidings; and, in a most moving and affecting manner, making use of our great mercies, as arguments with us to return to God, from whom we had departed³⁶.

Whitefield spent five days with Edwards, in October, 1740; they were important days in the lives of both men, more significant than then appeared to either of them. Three months later Whitefield returned to England, shortly afterwards paying his first visit to Scotland and strengthening—if not creating—the links between Jonathan Edwards and that land.

What is it we see in all this, and what message has it for us today? I suggest five points as worthy of consideration:—

(1) *The theological framework of these new creative impulses.* Jonathan Edwards, says Warfield, was

filled with the profoundest sense of the heinousness of sin, as an offence against the majesty of God and as outrage of His love; he set himself to arouse his hearers to some realisation of the horror of their condition as objects of the Divine displeasure, and of the incredible goodness of God in intervening for their salvation³⁷.

It is clear from all that has been said that classic Calvinism had within itself the essential evangelistic impulse. When the rock was smitten water gushed forth. What has this to say to us in our modern situation? It is surely significant that a skilful and sensitive apologist like Mr. C. S. Lewis is today saying very much the same thing as the old divines. In his *Broadcast Talks*³⁸, he insists on the difference between right and wrong as fundamental to an understanding of the universe:

Christianity tells people to repent and promises them forgiveness. It therefore has nothing to say to people who don't know they've done anything to repent of and who don't feel that they need any forgiveness. . . . When you have realised that our position is nearly desperate you'll begin to understand what the Christians are talking about.

It is, moreover, important to contrast the attitude of Jonathan Edwards and those influenced by him with the Neo-Calvinism of our own day which throws doubt on missionary endeavour overseas and on social reform at home, and which is really a return to the hyper-Calvinism from which Edwards set men free.

(2) *The primacy of individual decision* in response to a message of this kind. Latourette is undoubtedly right in saying that a distinctive feature of the whole modern missionary movement and of

³⁶ Tyerman, I. 429.

³⁷ E.R.E., V. 223.

³⁸ P. 32.

the spiritual impulses preparatory to it was "an emphasis upon the conversion of individual non-Christians and a distrust of mass movements of whole communities"³⁹. This, he points out, was in striking contrast to what happened in the Roman Empire and in the so-called conversion of Western and Northern Europe. Today sees a renewed emphasis on community and on the Church. In many ways this is sadly needed, but we need also to be sure that we conserve the essential things in that individual method of approach which brought such signal benefits to the whole world.

(3) Closely connected with this, and illustrated again and again in the story of missionary origins, *the vast extent of individual influence*, taken by God backwards and forwards from one continent to another. Who can estimate all that the little-known life of John Erskine meant in the purposes of God? Fuller was indeed right when he told Chalmers in 1813 how impressed he had been with "the importance that may attach to a single mind receiving an evangelical impression". We have largely lost, or forgotten, the power of the individual.

(4) *The important part played in the lives of all these individuals and groups by expectant, corporate, concerted prayer.*

(5) These new spiritual movements owed much to *young men*. "At its outset", says Latourette⁴⁰ of the Great Awakening, "it was led by youth, for at its inception all its outstanding exponents were in their twenties or thirties". So it was with Whitefield during his most effective early years. So it was with the little group of Baptists in Northamptonshire in the 1780s and early '90s. So it has surely been at the birth of all the creative movements in the history of the Church. Prof. E. H. Carr writes of the inadequacy in the political sphere of "the leadership of veterans". That is true also of the Church.

Do we not need today to be recalled to the central emphases of Calvinism, to the realization of the importance of individual decision and conversion, to faith in what one man may accomplish if he serve God sincerely, to an understanding of the necessity of prayer, and to the hope that God will once more give His message and His power to those of the younger generation?

³⁹ *History*, III. 51.

⁴⁰ III. 215.

WHY IS LIBERAL THEOLOGY UNPOPULAR IN THE CHURCH?

By the Rev. H. BULCOCK, M.A., B.D.

THIRTY or forty years ago there seemed to be the opening of a religious and theological revolution which promised a new stage in the Reformation of our Protestant Churches. There was a new conception of the real nature of the Scriptures involving a changed idea of the seat of authority in religion; there was a sense of the implications of evolution as applied to theological thought as well as to biological creation; comparative religion was making its suggestions; the new psychology was being born; the doctrine of the Divine Immanence was inviting a new interpretation of Christian theology. Traditionalism appeared to have received a wide-sweeping challenge from which it could hardly hope to survive. A faith of spiritual liberalism was to be the faith of the future.

During the last few years a curious reaction against what seemed to be the inevitable trend of modern religion has appeared. Christian humanism and liberalism are no longer popular. It is fashionable to pronounce them dead. Without rejecting the modern way of reading the Scriptures religious leaders have ignored or challenged the theological inferences which appeared to follow from the changed conception of Biblical study. The Churches have hailed Karl Barth as a prophet restoring orthodoxy broadly regarded. An influential movement has appeared even in Congregationalism finding the hope of religion and the Churches in a return to the dogmas of traditionalism. It is a strange phenomenon, for it runs counter to the general tendencies of modern education, scientific method, and today's growing secular knowledge. How do we account for it?

There is of course the influence of sheer conservatism. "We are worshippers of the old", says Emerson; "we do not believe in the riches of the soul in its proper eternity and omnipresence. We do not believe that there is any force in today to rival or re-create that beautiful yesterday". The average man does not like mental disturbance or the task of readjusting the ideas which he has had since childhood. He cherishes anything that can be said for his familiar way of looking upon things. Add to this the vague idea inherited from religious tradition that one's salvation is somehow involved in the acceptance of orthodoxy. Indeed it is amazing to realize how little the great revolution in regard to the nature of the

Bible has actually been understood in the average church. The rank and file still seem ignorant of it. Again, orthodoxy has on its side the subtle allies of familiarity, sentimental association, the "suggestiveness" of hymns and religious formulæ and the influence of early training. The Anglican liturgy has very beautiful and noble features, but its practical effect is to re-assert, twice a Sunday at least, a considerable amount of medieval religious ideas. Those same ideas are largely found in the older hymns sung in all branches of the Church. Once more, progressivism often involves a good deal of mental and social loneliness and misunderstanding. Man's herd-instinct drives him to seek companionship, common links, and agreements with his fellows. Few of us like to break away from commonly accepted opinion and sentiment. Conservatism from its very nature is always likely to have on its side the thicker ranks and the comfortable feeling of majorities.

Again, it seems true to say that Liberal Theology depends upon a set of motives which make less appeal to the average man than do the older religious systems. It does not answer as directly man's cruder but more deeply-set instincts. It offers no material favour or gain, no blessings of material prosperity or fortification against evils and misfortunes; it only promises the pure in heart that they shall "see God". The popularity and ecclesiastical success of Romanism is largely accounted for by its answering of elementary cupidity or fear. It has been said that church-going could be wonderfully stimulated if we, Protestants, had an acre of Purgatory for use. The older Protestant evangelicalism also often stressed the motives of gain and benefit. It taught the recompense idea—do good, believe aright, and God will bless you in this world with prosperity, and in the world to come you will win heaven and escape hell. Roger Lowe, the Presbyterian mercer, wrote in his diary (1663-9):

Thou Lord of hosts that rules in Heaven high,
Look down and help thy servant mightily;
Show me such favour as the world may know
That Thou esteemest of Thy servant, Lowe.

Liberalism has sought to substitute love of goodness for its own sake, the service of righteousness whether it pays or not, the doing of right even if it involves a cross. This presupposes a religious development and sense of spiritual appreciation perhaps comparatively rare. Liberalism rests upon a faculty less set and established in human personality, but at the same time finer and nobler.

Donald Hankey once said that the average man thought religion meant setting up to be better than your neighbour and believing that the whale swallowed Jonah. That is, the average man associates religion with miracle. He has the Jewish lust for signs and wonders. To him the challenge to a miracle seems to be

the denial of God and of the Divine working in the world. He does not see God in law but in the supposed breaking of law. He does not see that the Liberal Churchman realizes the sense of religious wonder in contemplating the marvel of familiar things and finding there the "supernaturalism" of a world "crammed with God".

Again, there is in the average man a strain of superstition. Evidences of this interest are to be found in the astrology columns of popular newspapers, belief in the influence of the planets, the stress on Bible prophecy, the cults of the Pyramids and British-Israelitism. Liberal religion can make no such appeal of occultism; simple goodness is much less thrilling.

Nor has Liberal religion the emotional appeal of the older faith. The images and terms of its gospel are less dramatic. It seems cold and intellectual in its presentation. The average man wants feeling and emotion. Nor has it gathered the warmth of sentimental association. In the long run it may gain this, but at first it may seem new and deterring. It has little attraction for the ardent sentimentalist.

Even in its thinking of religion in terms of *ethics* Liberalism may be chilling. One recollects the story told by the late Dr. Peake of the American evangelist, Sam Jones, whose audience of Negroes at a camp meeting was having a scrumptious time with "Amens" and "Hallelujahs" until the preacher turned his remarks to such awkward subjects as chicken-stealing. The "Amens" ceased, the "Hallelujahs" died down, and one of the platform supporters gently pulled the tail of the evangelist's coat and whispered, "Brudder Jones, don't you think that you're putting a damper on this 'ere meeting?"

Liberalism in religion is seriously handicapped by the very constitution of the Church, largely built on dogmatic tradition and legally fortified by it. In the case of the Roman Church the membership and the priesthood require acceptance of ancient dogma. The same is true in theory, and largely in practice, of the Anglican Church. Those who openly challenge its orthodoxy are not allowed to be religious teachers within its borders. Many fine spirits have found their way barred because they felt unable to accept Creeds and Articles with the spirit of honesty. Various ways of evasion have been devised, but even to these there are limits. It has been pointed out that few liberal spirits have been able to continue a bold, liberal witness when once within the ranks of the ordained ministry. The bias of conservatism has been too powerful. With the more liberal-minded the problem has arisen of reconciling new views with the formulæ framed under ancient conditions of thought and firmly embedded in both the articles of association and the liturgy of worship. The atmosphere of the

Church and that of the free University have been different. The bias has also been in evidence in the Free Churches. Some are as closely bound by formulæ as the Anglican Church; in others tradition operates as an unwritten but generally accepted law. There is a strong prejudice in favour of "safe" men as ministers, and of teaching which will not alienate the conservative, still a majority in nearly every church.

Again, Liberalism has suffered from its vagueness in expressing its positive beliefs. In a protest against dogma there has been a dislike to any new formulation which might seem like new dogma. In a challenge to classical creeds there has been a reluctance to make reasonable and helpful statements of positive faith. In our protests against formal mass-pronouncements overriding the sensitive discriminations of individuals we have hesitated to put down in black and white the things for which we stand collectively. Thus we have given an impression of vagueness, negation, and divided judgment. Perhaps also we have been so conscious of the impossibility of attaining finality of knowledge and so apprehensive of stereotyping knowledge at an imperfect stage that we have had little propagandist material of a positive kind. But we shall hardly gain the world by saying what we do not believe; we must be prepared to say, sometimes together as well as singly, what we believe without of course making the claim that it exhausts truth. A movement of religious life can never be built on the Everlasting Nay, nor abide in the Centre of Indifference. It must have an evangel of the Everlasting Yea. Again, Romanists, High Churchmen, and others have made much of the Church as an organization and medium of collective teaching. They have received their reward. We have been inclined to let truth look after itself. The case is rather parallel to a political school with excellent principles which pays no attention to political propaganda or organization and fails to win elections. Organization can kill life, but some measure of it is necessary to serve it.

Let us go deeper. It is sometimes charged against liberalism that it has no gospel for the sinner. One would answer that it has the evangel of Jesus Himself—redeeming respect for personality, the seeing of divine possibilities for publicans and sinners, the appeal to the best in the Magdalene and Zacchæus. But some of the older schools could point to miraculous and sudden conversions, release from a bondage which Paul describes as doing the things we would not and inability to do the things we would. But here psychology may be illuminating. The psychologist distinguishes between sin and "moral disease", between the drunkard who deliberately chooses to get drunk and the dipsomaniac who does not want to get drunk but is overwhelmed by an irresistible impulse to do so. Dr. Hadfield traces the latter condition to an

emotional complex similar to those which cause nervous disease. It is a disease and is susceptible to psychological treatment and release. The old-fashioned evangelist with his revivalist methods has acquired a psychological technique in dealing with such cases. It is a case of psychotherapy rather than of religion proper. It is indeed possible that the man suffering from what Dr. Hadfield calls "moral disease" could be successfully treated by a psychotherapist without a religious association at all, as we understand religion.

Possibly Liberalism in religion has sometimes stressed the intellectual elements to the minimizing or exclusion of the religious feature of worship, the mystical side of faith, the sense of fellowship with the Unseen. But obviously this neglect is not inherent in Liberalism; worship is not inconsistent with it. The devotional quality of such hymns as those written by Whittier, Lowell, Martineau, and others shows how rich Liberalism may be on the mystical and devotional side.

The present wave of reaction may possibly be accounted for by alarm at the opposite swing of the pendulum, socially and theologically. We have been passing through a period of challenge to convention in customs, fashions, habits, and morals. Undoubtedly in many instances the challenge has gone too far, and we are aware of the unhappy results. On the other hand some of the changes have been quite healthy. Surely discrimination is necessary. It is true that the spirit of challenge in the sphere of religion has often led to negations and barren faith. Illustrations may be found in three-quarters of the articles by our intelligentsia in the recent symposium volume, *I Believe*, which might be more appropriately headed *I Disbelieve*. We can understand men saying:

If this is the wilderness into which intellectual candour is leading us, better that we should turn to the dogmatic faith of older days, accept the authority of Church and Council or even of Pope, and cease this spirit of criticism and quest which leads only to vagueness and lostness. Better believe something mixed with error rather than nothing at all.

But it is also true, as Whittier has said, "The tree of faith her bare dead boughs must shed That nearer heaven the living ones may climb". The helpful parable for the situation is that found in *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Christian persuades his neighbour Pliable to accompany him in his quest of the City of God. Pliable goes willingly until the road leads into the Slough. The ground sinks for both of them and both try to escape. Pliable makes for the side he has left and struggles back in the direction of the City of Destruction. Christian makes for the other side and finds firmer ground leading up to the highway towards the Celestial City.

One may also note that apart from religion there has been a wave of social reaction against liberalism; religious conservatism seems only part of a larger process of social mentality. In *Across the Frontiers* Sir Philip Gibbs remarks:

Liberalism—by which I do not mean the party politics of so-called Liberals—is one of the qualities of the civilized mind which for a time, not very long, made good progress among men and nations. . . . That awareness of truth and that broad-mindedness were the glory of the 18th and 19th centuries, when it seemed that humanity was becoming more intelligent and more civilized. One cannot pretend that it has not had a set-back in the years since the first world-war. The areas of civilization, defined in these terms, are shrinking in spite of all the opportunities of education and the rapidity of communication. That we are drifting back to barbarism is one of the realities of the modern world about which we should have no delusions.

The reactionary *Zeitgeist*, "the flight from reason", has favoured reactionary theology.

One of the chief elements in our theological reaction is to be found in the social, economic, and political conditions of the last quarter of a century in particular. Barthianism had its rise in the consequences of the last war. The situation was irreconcilable with the thought of the amiable gratifying deity associated with some types of liberal thinking. There was a challenge to the idea of human progress and materialistic humanism. The world seemed to be in the hands of evil principalities and powers; how could man by his own efforts escape the bondage? Men's thoughts turned back to the old idea of a universe divided between God and Satan, and to the conception of an apocalyptic deliverance as man's only hope. Immanence, humanism, evolution—all the great words of Liberal Theology—had been discredited.

This conservative attitude seemed to have experience and realism on its side, and yet it is philosophically unsatisfying and morally unsound. However difficult the problem of evil may be, it can never be solved by an ultimate division of the universe. There must be one supreme principle of the cosmos—one Lord, all lords above, a God who "makes the darkness and the light and dwells not in the light alone". The other difficulty is moral. As far as we can see the universe has been planned for an ethical end. Man has been given freedom, responsibility, and a task. There could be no victory without a battle, no triumph without striving, no character without a test. "When the fight begins, a man's worth something". But if God is to work apocalyptically through external intervention the whole moral scheme of the universe breaks down. God takes the work and responsibility out of men's hands; morality is superseded; the idea of character being shaped,

moulded, developed, in the strenuous school of life and effort—that is gone! God has failed in the original constitution of the world. We cannot believe it!

Again it is worth while taking into consideration a paragraph or two in Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent statement in the *Congregational Quarterly*:

My own feeling is that the recent dead set at liberalism owes a good deal of its zest, though not of course all, to the natural inclination of man in a state of depression and bewilderment to look round to some party or other as the villains of the piece and to seek comfort in well belabouring the chosen scapegoat. . . . A certain belief in the goodness, dignity and capacity of human nature was always taken to be an outstanding feature of liberalism; so now being disgusted with human nature as we see it in Nazism and Fascism and distrustful of it as we see it in ourselves, we find it to be quite an exhilarating task to say about it all the nasty things we can.

"In the vocabulary of the theologians", says Dr. Peel,

only one word is more at a discount than "liberalism" and it is "humanism". Once people were proud to call themselves humanists — now there is none so poor as to do the word reverence. Humanism—it stands for *hubris*, insolence, contempt of God, and it has brought the world into chaos and war. What nonsense it all is! The Christian preacher will lift up his voice and cry; How great is man. I believe in him because Jesus who knew what was in man believed in him. Man can make war, but he can co-operate with God and make a garden. He can blast cities to bits, but he can build better ones where little children will have the opportunities of a full and free life. He can be base and cruel, but he is capable of endurance and sacrifice. He is a sinner, but by God's grace he can become a saint. That is Christian humanism rooted in the life and teaching of Jesus.

While we cannot doubt the fact of this conservative reaction and the unpopularity of theological liberalism in the Church, we may get a wrong impression of the state of religious thought and feeling in the country by making our observation in too limited a field. Religion is not altogether confined to the churches. There is much of it in life and thought outside the sphere of organized religion. There is the faith of what is commonly called "the man in the street", which can by no means be ignored in our survey. There is the private religion of the writer, the editor, the student, the politician, the schoolmaster, the ordinary citizen. These men and women have their own ways of realizing God, of recognizing the spiritual significance of life and of serving the highest. This class includes many people who in recent years have been alienated from the Churches because the Churches have so often insisted

upon a narrower faith and type of idealism than these people have come to hold. The pity of it! The late Beatrice Webb wrote:

Like many of my contemporaries I am a religious outcast. I cannot enjoy without sacrificing intellectual integrity the immeasurable benefits of spiritual companionship . . . and while I rejoice in the advance of science I deplore the giving up of regular religious services with their encouragement of worship and prayer, for the good reason that personal experience and the study of history convince me that this absence of the religious habit leads to an ugly chaos in private and public morals, and to a subtle lowering of the sense of beauty.

But there the fact is, and whether religion seems to be growing more conservative or more progressive largely depends on where we look for it—within or without the Churches. Inside the Churches religious tendencies seem at the moment conservative and reactionary; outside the Churches religion is, on the whole, liberal and progressive.

Perhaps even within the Churches the swing over to conservatism may not be quite as decided as we are inclined to think. There are still factors of liberalism in our church life which we must take into account. After all, every theological college of standing has come to base its teaching on the modern critical study of the Bible. Every ministerial fraternal has its theologically liberal members. Every public library contains the work of modernist scholars. We have the impression that few sermons are really fundamentalist—they are rather theologically insipid and colourless. One sees few signs of the neo-orthodox theologians making much real appeal to the rank and file ministry, even if we must confess that the term Modernist is unfashionable with the same class. Even the present world situation may lead men to a more realistic faith and to an appreciation of the things that really matter in religion. Every critical and revolutionary period will send sensible people to deeper views of God and life. A fiery Day of the Lord blazes away the wood, hay, and stubble. This tendency we must set against that of Barthianism, Second Adventism and British-Israelitism as products of the war situation.

It is important to realize that the truth or otherwise of a trend of religious thought is not to be determined by its success or non-success in terms of numerical allegiance at a particular time. We do not discover truth by counting heads. We cannot measure the favour of God by noting the numerically successful churches. We recollect that the scribes and Pharisees, the people who seemed to be somewhat in the Church of Christ's own generation, pronounced against His message; even the crowds, having got over the novelty of His teaching, melted away; at the last, all forsook Him and fled. We must fortify ourselves with other tests of truth.

We cannot go back to anything which we feel to be untrue or unworthy of God; we cannot accept doctrines which fall below the tests and standards of the Master. Even the wilderness has its compensations. There is no power more uplifting than the sense of honesty to a gleam of truth; nothing more inspiring than the thought that one is doing some little to serve a clearer faith in the future, to move the heavy wheels of progress, to help to create a greater Church in coming days. It may be that we of the liberal school of thought have not conceived or at any rate brought home certain sides of faith which are necessary for men's souls. Experience has perhaps to teach us other aspects of religion. But we believe that the Spirit of Truth will guide us into all the truth, that "truth will heal the wounds which truth herself doth make", and that whatever deficiencies there may be in our present way of conceiving or presenting things, the scientific methods of our quest will lead us to the fullness of truth and knowledge.

The Dean of Durham's **God and My Neighbour* (Murray, 1s.) is an urgent appeal that Christians should put our Lord's commandments about loving God and neighbour into practice. It would do all Christians good to read it, though some will be irritated by careless sentences like "the obligation . . . should be impressed on *all* young Christians at the time of their *Confirmation*". And what does Dr. Alington mean by saying the average Englishman hated Protestantism because it was sponsored by *Dutchmen*? On the other hand, there are fine *obiter dicta* such as "we dishonour God if we think too meanly of man whom He has made".

A Just and Durable Peace (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), by fourteen leaders of the American Churches, would make an excellent basis for group discussion: Prof. John C. Bennett's examination of the six types of policy possible after the war, under the title "Peace Terms must not be a Vehicle for Vengeance", is especially serviceable from this point of view. "G. P. Gooch", please.

It would be impossible for any book about twisted tormented John Donne to be dull, and Miss Hardy's *Donne: A Spirit in Conflict* (Constable, 10s. 6d.) is not that. But a long list of *Errata* does not inspire confidence, and unhappily that list is far from complete. Miss Hardy sees in Donne another Hamlet, but it cannot be said that her attempts to solve the riddle are convincing. There is a useful Chronological Table and a List of Extant Likenesses.

Though readers of Miss Joan Grant's *Lord of the Horizon* (Methuen, 9s. 6d.) who have not read *Eyes of Horus*, which describes the first twenty-one years of its hero's life, may at first find themselves at a disadvantage, they will nevertheless swiftly be carried away by the story. Miss Grant makes the people of the Nile Valley of long ago live again, and as she shows the interplay of love and fear in individual and national life, the reader feels that the book is not irrelevant to the 20th century.

RELIGION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

By Prof. JOHN MACMURRAY, M.C., M.A.

COMMUNISM, as we know, distrusts religion and opposes Christianity. The Soviet Union, the first-fruits of Communist success, is the great achievement of our time, and holds the promise of a new and better life for the masses of the world. The leadership of progress is in Russian hands. Other countries either resist the pull to the future with savage violence, or move haltingly and reluctantly in the direction that Russia has defined. Yet Soviet Russia is the first great nation utterly to reject religion and to establish a purely secular civilization in the world. She points the way to a future without God. This is the fact that faces the Christian Church; and its implications are so grave that they make all other religious problems seem insignificant. In this generation the Christians have to settle accounts with the Communists, and the future of the world depends on the settlement. The religious issue in Russia is the decisive question, not only for the Christian Church, but for world-civilization.

Few Christians would deny this. Yet it is astonishing how little effort has been made to understand its significance. In no field is the superficiality of our religious insight so clearly exhibited. It is a matter of extreme urgency that Christianity should set itself the task of overcoming the resistance to religion in the new civilization, and of making modern Communism Christian. This is the mission of the Church in our time; and it is inescapable. A Christianity which defends itself is already lost. Yet how little progress we have made toward the goal, in the quarter of a century which has passed since the Russian revolution! How little a distance we have gone in the preliminary task of comprehending, from the religious standpoint, what has happened and why it has happened!

Much has been written on the subject of the relation of Communism to Christianity. Most of it has been honest and superficial; much of it merely stupid; not a little positively dishonest and wicked. Communism is not to be understood at a glance. It challenges too many of the assumptions which underlie our accustomed ways of thought. To grasp it we have to unlearn much that we take for granted, and adjust ourselves to a point of view which is new and unfamiliar. This is, no doubt, why the best guides are men who have themselves been through the revolutionary school, and who have felt in their own experience the strength and cogency of the Communist case. These men know that there is no easy answer to the Marxist criticism, and that much of it cannot be refuted. Perhaps, indeed, there is no answer which does

not involve a revolution in our own ways of thought and life. It is important that we should understand Communism, and it is not easy for us to do so. For the understanding depends, above all, upon the spirit of our approach. It needs on our part humility, courage, and faith, willingness to learn and to repent.

For those who will make the effort I should like to recommend warmly a little book which has just appeared under the title *A Christian Approach to Communism*¹. Its second part is an effort to show how much there is in common between many of the characteristic ideas of Marxist theory and elements in the Christian tradition; and though difficult in parts to those who are unfamiliar with philosophical discussion, it is full of interest and rich in suggestion. But it is the first part of the book which holds the greatest significance for us, and this part is very simple. It defines and expresses the attitude of mind and spirit which must characterize any fruitful approach to the whole problem, and it shows how unfounded and wrong-headed are many of the criticisms of Communism and of Soviet Russia which are current in Christian circles. It is difficult for us in this country to distinguish effectively between the Christian ideas proper, and the social conceptions of liberal capitalism in which we are soaked. This little book can help us greatly to make this distinction clearly, and much turns upon our success. For our danger lies in thinking that we are defending Christianity against its enemies when in fact we are struggling to preserve an outworn social system, by no means Christian in its essence, against the forces of human progress. So long as we do this, however sincerely and unconsciously, we are certain to follow a policy in our relations with Communism which (to quote Mr. Nersoyan) may "prove fatal to the Christian cause"; and must fail to adopt the true Christian strategy—"one of a bold understanding and sympathy, a sincere appreciation of what is good in the opponent's camp, and the working out of a policy with a view of eventual reconciliation".

The Communist opposition to religion must be taken seriously if it is to be successfully countered. There is an optimistic view of the matter which treats it as a superficial effervescence of revolutionary iconoclasm which will die away as conditions in Russia return to normal. There is also a pessimistic view which ascribes it to the wickedness and perversity of men in rebellion against the will of God. Both these interpretations are equally mistaken. Communist atheism is both fundamental and sincere. It is grounded in a reasoned conviction, for which both theoretical and practical reasons of considerable weight are advanced. Consequently it requires a practical, as well as a theoretical refutation; and in both aspects this refutation must go deep enough to reach

¹ By Tiran Nersoyan (Muller, 3s. 6d.).

the level in which the opposition to religion is rooted and from which it draws its nourishment. The trouble with most of the current answers is that they are too superficial to be effective, even when they are correct so far as they go. They fail to go to the root of the matter; and this failure arises because to go deeper would involve a criticism of our own religious tradition which we are unable or afraid to make.

That revolutions should attack religion is nothing new. It is a commonplace of the history of Christendom. In earlier days the attack on religion itself took a religious form, and sought to establish a new form of religion in the place of the one it condemned. Luther and Calvin brought to success the revolution which ushered in the modern world by destroying the power of medieval Christianity. The English Nonconformists won the fight for democracy by their attack upon the established Church. The French revolution attacked revealed religion in the name of a "religion of Reason". It was left to the Communist revolution to attack religion as such, in all its forms, in the name of empirical science. Thus every great step upward in European progress has involved a successful assault upon the stronghold of established religion; and if we follow the stages of the process we notice that the direction is always the same. It moves towards the emancipation of the human mind from the control of traditional religious authority. The Protestant Reformation secured freedom from the dogmatic authority of the medieval Church and allowed the individual believer to interpret holy Scripture by the light of his own experience. The French revolution rejected the authority of Scripture in favour of the freedom of speculative Reason. The Russian revolution has gone farther by abolishing even the form of religious authority—of which speculative Reason is the ghost—for the sake of scientific truth, empirical and experimental, and never final or absolute. From Luther to Lenin the line of advance is continuous.

If this were all, we might deny with some that this movement was indeed a progress, and consider it a descent to the abyss. But we notice another fact, that each step in the process which attacks and diminishes the authority of traditional religion is also a step which takes us nearer the realization of Christian ideals in the material life of our civilization. Christianity is the dynamic behind the revolutions, and holds them to the track which it has defined. It is this pressure of the Christian purpose which lies behind the attacks on established religious authority. Modern Communism itself would be inconceivable without the Christian tradition. It is, indeed, the result of a deliberate attempt to cut the social content of Christianity loose from its religious associations and set it up as the goal of a secular Humanism. This is enough in itself to show

that Christianity and Communism, in spite of their mutual enmity, have much in common that is fundamental; and this makes of their opposition a paradox that cries for explanation. It is as though the practice of Christianity had turned against its theory. The resolution of such a conflict is not merely possible; it is inevitable.

Consider the practical grounds of the Communist criticism. They are expressed in the conviction that to achieve social justice, human equality, and brotherhood it is necessary to break the hold of religion upon the hearts of men. To put it in words that no Communist would use, Christianity is the enemy of every effort to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. That is what it comes to. The Churches can be relied upon to oppose any practical attempt to end the exploitation of man by man. This judgment is based upon a reading of history. It is reinforced by the story of the struggle between religion and science. Science is the instrument of liberation in our day. Religion has always fought the advances of scientific theory; how much more will it try to prevent a scientific practice. The crux of this argument lies in the belief that there is an unbridgeable gulf between the scientific and the religious mind; not so much in any conflict between religious and scientific beliefs. Facing the task of transforming the amorphous mass of the illiterate and primitive Russian peasantry into a modern industrialized society with a high level of education as well as a high standard of material welfare, and of abolishing exploitation in the process, the Bolsheviks were convinced that success depended upon substituting a scientific attitude of mind for the existing religious attitude, in the whole population. Religion meant, they thought, resignation and submission now in the hope of reward hereafter. Science meant a refusal to submit, an effort to wrestle with circumstances, a willingness to abandon traditional ways of life, to experiment and achieve without hope of personal reward. This is the nerve of the *practical* opposition to religion in the Soviet Union. Religion cannot provide the dynamic for the social effort to use science as the instrument of progress, because the temper of religion is incompatible with the scientific temper. Clearly this can only be refuted practically, by making religion the motive force of just such an effort. But where in the world of today are we to find such a phenomenon—a Christianity penetrated by the spirit of science, experimental, empirical, and positive, confident in its power to change the world and turn it upside down?

The theoretical opposition of Communism to Christianity goes even deeper, though it reflects the same experience. In Marx, the negation of religion is not an idiosyncrasy, it is the root from which his whole theory springs. "The criticism of religion", he

wrote, "is the beginning of all criticism"; and he used it as the touchstone for distinguishing between friend and foe in the battle of ideologies. This rejection of religion remains the keystone of Communist theory. Remove it and the whole edifice will collapse. But it is essential to understand what Marx meant by "religion" in this connexion; what he took to be the essence of all religion. Communism identifies religion with idealism, and opposes to it a materialist philosophy. But "idealism", like "materialism", is an ambiguous term which may easily mislead. It is better to re-state the essential issue in other terms. What Communism attacks in religion is *dualism*. The religious tradition of Europe, in all its forms, is dualistic. It rests upon the opposition of matter and spirit. Its world outlook and its valuation of life depend upon maintaining a separation between the spiritual and the material. This dualism of doctrine reflects a division of *life* into a spiritual and a material aspect, which are separated in thought and feeling, and so far as possible in practice also. The Communist would maintain that this dualism in thought and value has its source in the tension between an exploiting and an exploited class in society. But it is more to the point here to observe that this separation of the spiritual aspect of life from the material is the basis of the traditional compromise between Church and State. Christianity contains in its very nature the demand for a social order in conformity to its own principles. It can only function as the accepted religion of a society which contradicts them by distinguishing the spiritual world from the material world, by contrasting this world with "another" world. This makes it possible to surrender all material authority to the State, while retaining for the Church the lordship of the spiritual realm. The Christian social teaching inevitably works as a revolutionary ferment in society. An established religion necessarily functions as a conservative force, sustaining and confirming the established order, and checking tendencies to rebellion against the temporal authority. The dualism of the Christian tradition has been shaped by this dilemma. A Christian Church which demanded consistently that the contemporary world should be governed, in its material affairs, by the principles of Christianity, would find itself in perpetual conflict with the State, and could not become an "established" Church. The opposition of the spiritual life to the material allows the material life of society to be regulated by "practical" non-Christian principles, provided the State will acknowledge the "spiritual" validity of the social principles of Christianity, and accept them as ideals which *should* be followed, though they are not, and which *will* be realized in another world. Thus the dualism of spirit and matter is a psychological mechanism which enables the Church to share social authority with the State, and enables individual citi-

zens to be loyal to both, so long as neither trespasses upon the domain assigned to the other.

Clearly the practical basis of such a compromise is that the Church, while holding up the Christian principles as ideals, shall not itself take action for their realization, and shall restrain its members from attempting to do so. The exclusion of the Church from the material field is, indeed, its exclusion from direct social action. This is the basis of the contention that religion is "opium for the people", that it inculcates resignation to existing conditions in this world while promising a better life in "another" world. Such a dualism of "the spiritual" and "the material" is clearly incompatible with revolutionary activity; and Communism considers it the essence of all religion. Religion is "idealist"; it confines itself to the world of ideas; of dreams, hopes, and aspirations. Materialism, on the other hand, rejecting this doctrine, demands that men should unify theory and practice and act, in revolutionary fashion if need be, to realize their dreams.

The only satisfactory reply to this Communist criticism of religion would be a proof that religion is not necessarily dualist; that Marx was wrong in thinking that the separation of spirit and matter is inherent in all religion. Theoretically it is not difficult to provide this; for the Jewish religion, as we meet it in the Old Testament, was the organizing principle of Hebrew society, and shows hardly a trace of the distinction between the spiritual and the material fields. It is, in the Communist sense, materialist; and this "Jewish materialism" is the explicit ground on which Hitler has persecuted the Jews. Christianity, in the New Testament and in the primitive Church, is equally "materialist", looking for the immediate coming of the Kingdom on earth. But there is no denying that the tradition of European Christianity, since the Middle Ages at least, is fundamentally dualist; and that the position of the Churches in secular society depends upon this. The only satisfactory answer to the Communist charge at the present day would be the transformation of the traditional dualism and the rediscovery of a Christian "materialism".

But there are signs that a compromise with the Church in Soviet Russia itself is not out of the question. During the war the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union has gained a measure of recognition by the leaders of Russia. It has proved its complete loyalty to Russia in the struggle against Nazism, and so has cleared itself of any suspicion of counter-revolutionary tendencies. Its congregations have raised tremendous sums of money for the defence of the country, and have been publicly thanked by Stalin for their support. Both this year and last the government waived the security regulations to allow the traditional all-night Easter services to be held in the Orthodox Churches, and at Easter this

year the acting Patriarch was allowed to broadcast by radio a message to all the Orthodox Churches of the world. These may be small signs, but they are significant; and it seems certain already that after the war the position of religion in Soviet Russia will be greatly improved. Nor is there much to be surprised at in this. The Communist argument against religious dualism is effective only for revolutionary purposes. A Church which inculcates submission to the powers that be, and discourages revolutionary tendencies, may not be so unwelcome in a Socialist society which has been firmly established, as it was to the band of revolutionaries who had to struggle with the forces of the old order.

THE CHURCH MILITANT.

THE Swiss paper, *Semeur Baudois*, declares that in the hope of bringing the Nazi atrocities to an end the Greek Orthodox clergy, headed by the Archbishop of Athens, offered themselves instead as victims of the firing squads. The Archbishop told the German authorities:

"You believe that the massacre of innocent people is indispensable to the maintenance of order. You kill fathers and sons whose families are broken and left without support, without bread. You take intellectuals, men of great value, as hostages. I have a list of persons whom you could shoot without society suffering immeasurably, without their loss occasioning the ruin of the home".

When given the list, the Germans found that the Archbishop had headed it with his own name, followed by the names of all the Greek clergy. The Germans refused the offer, asserting that it would deepen the chasm between the Greek people and the occupying forces and would suggest that Germany was persecuting the Greek Church.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

RECONSTRUCT TO HEAR THE WORD !

THERE is a great deal of talk at the present time about the Congregational Union's Reconstruction Fund. Reconstruction is an ambiguous word, with both a material and a spiritual meaning. The spiritual meaning is clearly the more important, if less easy to grasp than the material. To pay so much attention to the need for new buildings that we close our eyes to the steady decrease in all our statistics will not exonerate us from a criminal sentimentalism. If a handful of people in a large old church, struggling under an increasing debt, give generously towards the erection of other buildings, there is nothing very commendable in that. If they were to sell their own building for the site, one would feel more hopeful that among them there were seers and prophets, creative and imaginative spirits who might provide the foundations of a more spiritual life. We need the creative spirit even more than the constructive, ourselves to become new creations and to be built up unto Christ¹ even more than to have new chapels. If there is no life, we may build temples, but there will be no glory of the Lord to fill them.

It is clear, however, that new churches must be built, and it is to be hoped that the utmost care will be taken over their building. In the first place, they should be built primarily as *churches*. It is not part of our faith that a church is in itself a holy place, and in the new housing estates it is probably inevitable and right that our churches should be built to serve also as social centres. Yet I confess to some discomfort when a building is made as adaptable as that at West End, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Here there is a dais with pulpit and table at one end, and a dais with curtains at the other, and the chairs have only to be turned about for the building to be no longer a church but a theatre. Can a church become a theatre as easily as that?

The question raises far wider issues. The object for which a church is built is the worship of God. In the main, the worship of God is, and always has been, after one of two ways, according as it is with the help of the eye or of the ear. The two ways may be called the Hellenic and the Hebraic. For the former worship means "See and adore"; for the latter it means

¹ Both images are biblical. It is unfortunate that *recreation* and *edification* have been so narrowly side-tracked. *Reconstruction* is not a word which any woman would have chosen, but it at least lacks the invalidism of *rally*.

"Hear and obey". In the Christian Church the Catholic emphasis is the Hellenic, the Protestant is the Hebraic. The change in liturgical emphasis which the Reformation effected is picturesquely suggested by the brasses of two priests in the parish church of Coleshill, Warwickshire². The one priest, who died in 1500, holds a chalice, the symbol of the sacramental mysteries; the other, who died in 1566, holds a Bible, representing the Word of God in the vernacular. The sacrament, as observed in Catholic churches, is something to be seen; the Bible, as read and expounded in Protestant churches, is something to be heard.

Consequently, when the Nonconformists, who with rare exceptions³ were the first to build after the Reformation, erected new churches, they did not attempt to copy the medieval model; they built meeting-houses for the preaching and the hearing of the Word of God, *auditoria* rather than theatres. They did not build long churches, in which the perspective might enhance the vision of the mysteries performed in a distant chancel. Nor did they build high churches, in whose vaults the singing of Latin to Gregorian music might lose itself in heavenly sweetness. They built relatively low, and square, or nearly square, churches, with the pulpit in the middle of the longer wall⁴, the table beneath it, and the congregation gathered round, often in a gallery as well as in the area, with not one of them far away. The pulpit was as central as the table; the bread of life was broken in preaching as well as in the sacrament. Liturgically, such a plan expressed the ideal of the gathered church, the holy community, and undoubtedly increased the congregational feeling. Practically, the purpose which it sought to realize, and which it did realize, was that everyone could hear.

It is instructive to watch the gradual weakening in the Protestant tradition⁵, as the Oxford Movement set the fashion in the nineteenth century. The bicentenary of the Ejection of 1662 was ironically celebrated all over the country by the erection of pseudo-Gothic chapels. Gradually the building is lengthened; then transepts appear, if only to break the monotony of line; finally chancels return, liturgically differentiated by steps, sometimes even, as at Mere, Wilts.⁶, with an apsidal termination. An inevitable consequence was the removal of the pulpit from the centre back to a lateral, and often to a corner position. In recent churches the central pulpit is practically never to be found. One wonders who the architects of these churches are, or have been. Have they been Anglicans, or have they been unaware of any other tradition? Have they ever given a thought, one almost asks, to the *purpose* of the buildings they have erected?

For a congregation which has two sermons and three or four Bible readings every Sunday, but a sacramental service only once or twice a month, the arrangement now usual is most unsuitable. For myself, I agree with Dale's stricture on Mansfield College Chapel, that it is a disgrace to have to preach the Word of God from a corner; but a corner pulpit is equally objectionable from a practical point of view. It means that during the hymns the people sing facing away from the pulpit, and the relationship

² Cf. A. Earle, "A Meditation upon Two Ancient Brasses," in *The Modern Churchman*, Oct., 1940, 280 ff.

³ After the completion of Bath Abbey (1520) in the traditional Perpendicular style, very few churches were built, though they are occasionally to be found, e.g., Little Gidding, Hunts. (1629), and St. Mary's, Marlborough, Wilts. (1654).

⁴ E.g., Old Meeting, Norwich (1693); Rook Lane, Frome, Somerset (1707).

⁵ The Protestant, not only the Nonconformist, tradition: witness Wren's interiors.

⁶ At Mere the pulpit remains central, in the apse! The liturgical purpose of an apse was for procession round the altar. No one wants to process round a pulpit.

between them and the minister, which (rightly understood and used) means so much, is continually interrupted. It means that during the sermon the people have either to twist their necks or to skew round in their seats in order to see the minister, and that the axis of the building acts as a perpetual distraction of their attention.

What is still more important and unfortunate is that, in copying the Anglican plan, our architects do not copy it completely. Where there are transepts, they frequently place the pulpit at the far side of the crossing, away from the congregation. Now in an Anglican service it matters almost as little as in a Roman Catholic whether the chanting and praying are heard accurately: the prayers are familiar to the congregation, and in any case prayers as well as chants may be followed in the Prayer Book. For the parts of the service in which audibility is essential—the lessons and sermon—the Anglican priest leaves the chancel and stands at the lectern or in the pulpit; and in almost every case⁷ noted over a period of years the pulpit is on the near side of the crossing, close to the congregation, and even sometimes, as in York Minster or at St. Mary's, Oxford, well down the nave, in the midst of the congregation. If the voice has to travel across a lofty crossing, with transeptal passages to add further diversions, no one can wonder if it is lost or blurred; and in Anglican churches the lesson has almost always been learned. In *our* churches the minister prays and reads Scripture, as well as preaches, from the pulpit; the sermon normally takes the place of the sacrament as the climax of worship, and, though shortened, is still the longest single element; the prayers are usually the minister's own composition, so that their audibility is essential if they are to lead the devotions of the congregation. Yet in these very churches the pulpit is often placed so as to make audibility difficult, if not virtually impossible. Much depends, it is true, on the minister's elocution; but that is no reason for hindering rather than helping his audibility. It is a matter of great importance.

Reconstruct to hear! The phrase should not be cast aside as merely utilitarian or as unworthily concentrating on the manward side of our worship. The phrase "I'm going to hear Mr. So-and-so" is unfortunate, yet a *corruptio optimi*. Our ideal of worship embraces the ideal of consecrated personality: the two words need equal stress, and to run from the Protestant faith in personality, when recreated by God's Spirit, is to run into the Catholic faith in the mechanical performance of an *opus operatum*. We have no cause to be ashamed of representing the Protestant side, the Hebraic and Biblical side, in Christian liturgy. In our services the Bible should be read, the prayers should be uttered, the sermon should be preached, all as part of the worship of God; and for all three audibility is essential—essential for *worship*. To go with others to hear someone preach and pray and read the Bible, if that someone is a true minister of Jesus Christ, need not mean that we are not going to worship God; but it does mean that we have chosen a way of worship which depends on our being able to *hear* the words of grace which proceed out of the minister's mouth.

In building our new churches our architects might do worse than cast an eye at the new Roman Catholic churches which are springing up all over the country. Mostly modern in conception, with a reliance on straight lines rather than curves, these churches are almost always studiously simple, often of undressed brick and unstained glass, and without, or with only very formal, transepts. They are mission churches, erected with an eye to the national temperament and national prejudices; and, since for the con-

⁷ Durham Cathedral is an exception, and in the nave there the sermon, despite the loud speakers, is so blurred as to be almost inaudible.

version of the unbeliever even the Catholic must depend on preaching more than on the sacrament, there is usually a prominent pulpit from which sermons in the vernacular may be heard by all. The contrast between Catholic and Protestant worship is a real one, and is sharp enough, I would suggest, to receive the most careful consideration in the planning and building of our new churches. It will be a pity if we cannot learn from the Catholics at least to combine modernity with tradition, good visibility with equally good audibility. In our churches most of all, we shall never attract, let alone convert, a single soul, if he cannot *hear* prayers, lessons, and sermon, and thus enter into the worship of God and receive forgiveness and blessing unto his soul.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

THE CHURCH OF THE LAITY. INDIVIDUAL EVANGELISM.

A RECENT handbook for Christian study contains this striking information: "The day of the sermon is over". Is this true? The imagination is at once stimulated and exercised in envisaging the dismantlement of innumerable pulpits, relics henceforth of a past mode of religious life, no longer required as an expression of vital Christian fellowship. But the suggestion was not intended to startle but to express an entire view of religious thought and witness. There is nothing here to compare with the recent announcement of an American movie magnate, that he was about to inaugurate the preacherless church by bringing within the range of every citizen the best preaching and singing that sixpence could buy. On the contrary, it is the whole philosophy of Churchmanship that we are called upon to consider.

Among the great pulpit figures that Scotland has produced perhaps it is a sound judgment which gives a chief place to Henry Drummond. Visitors to Edinburgh may still discover in the homes of both rich and poor a memory of his great preaching. But it is interesting to note Drummond's personal scepticism concerning the office which he himself fulfilled so memorably. In these words he summed up his personal view: "I must say I believe more and more every day in personal dealing, and in the inadequacy of mere preaching". Drummond was not denouncing the pulpit, nor was he renouncing it. He was pointing out that the pulpit, however brilliant, is, left to itself, futile. This is certainly true as far as the spread of essential Christianity is concerned.

Coming to our own day, it is equally interesting to note the opinion so clearly voiced by Dr. Inge. Recalling an analogy of St. Chrysostom, he writes:

If we were to fill a number of narrow necked vessels with water, should we set them up in rows and dash a bucket of water over them? That is the method of the pulpit. A few drops may get in here and there, but most of the water is wasted.

Dr. Inge, too, is not denouncing the pulpit, nor is he renouncing it. He, too, is pointing out that the pulpit, however brilliant, is, left to itself, futile. One might have expected expressions of this kind from some soured critic in the pew. They are the more impressive when they come from the pulpit itself.

It is profitable to note that several Christian Societies dispense altogether with set preachers. The Society of Friends, for example, reports that it regards set preaching as offensive, unspiritual in its very nature, and dull.

To the Quakers the idea of separated ministers seems equally unspiritual, and this not because they do not recognize the ministry, but (as one of them finely puts it) because they do not recognize the laity. All are ministers, and in the full sense. Historically the Society of Friends has occasionally allowed—it has certainly not encouraged—a member here and there to undertake a sort of separated and remunerated ministry in certain areas where complete Quaker methods showed little signs of growth. But the experiments have invariably proved disappointing and have almost as invariably been regretted. "We should have done better to have shown more faith and started a Quaker Meeting", says John William Graham. Or one might call The Brethren to witness. In a statement of their fundamental method and worship, we read that "any Brother, without ordination, may be the Spirit's vehicle for instruction in our assemblies". One thinks, too, of the numerous cults and sects which have sprung up amongst us so rapidly during the last generation—the Christian Science Church, the New Thought Movement, the New Teaching Communities, the Russellites, and many others. These societies have their lectures and their lecturers, just as we also might have ours; those who attend them equip themselves with pencil and paper to assist the memory. But for the regular meeting of worship it is to the ranks that the society looks for its inspiration, its instruction, and its testimony. These sects and cults have spread and multiplied at an amazing rate, and they present a vivid comparison with the orthodox Churches: We can state in a few words the secret of this signal success. It lies in the individual evangelism to which each and every member devotes himself. Each and every member makes it his or her personal business to secure others. Each and every member is full of the joy of discovery, and has a secret that he simply must tell. Not one or two, head and shoulders above all the rest, but all the members, have found some great new thing which has released them from previous emptiness and unreality, and to them it is the pearl of great price that they have found. They have been emancipated, and "O that all might taste and see". Moreover, this personal evangelism has not been commanded or recommended from headquarters as being a discreet piece of policy; on the contrary, it is free and spontaneous, the natural outburst and open expression of personal experience. So the movements grow, not through the pulpit oratory of the few, but by the personal individual witness of the many.

If this vitality strikes a contrast with the orthodox Christian communions, it strikes a parallel with the beginnings of Christianity:

Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon and saith unto him, "We have found the Messiah", and he brought him to Jesus. . . . Philip findeth Nathanael and saith unto him, "We have found Jesus. Come and see".

This is the missionary method, as when that other Philip espying a fellow traveller by the way, "drew near to him and joined himself to his chariot and preached unto him Jesus". In subsequent days when Christian witnesses settled down into community life, they organized themselves according to the capacities of their own members. There was a difference of function but a fundamental equality of spiritual status, because of a fundamental equality of experience. Presbyters and Bishops were all laymen. Those who went out as pioneers, went out as often as not without scrip or purse as our Lord ordained—a kind of preaching friars, as it were. St. Paul himself was proud to say that he had not received a penny piece for the exercise of ministry. He expressed the view that he would have been entitled to receive recompense: his Lord took a different view, but in

any case we can be glad Paul omitted to claim what he considered to be his rights.

From these and kindred considerations, there are good reasons for bringing together two or three basic affirmations:

(i) Christianity, at the start and in its essence, was and is a lay movement. In this fundamental feature it resembles Buddhism. The latter, like the former, has moved away from its original state—a departure which began almost as soon as its founder had gone away. It was a departure which the Teacher would have refused to recognize and would have repudiated. Of the Christian religion we have this further confidence, that its goal as well as its origin lies in a lay community. The question arises—should we return to a lay basis forthwith? If vested interests on the one hand, and prejudice on the other, can be put aside, it ought to be possible to consider this matter unemotionally. Some will think that the work of the teacher is essential in this complex world in which we live, and that such a work will require a full-time devotion both for training in it and for the practice of it. Others will emphasize the need of a pastoral ministry, which again would require a complete devotion of time and energy. It is this that was in the mind of Henry Drummond and of Dr. Inge. To a ministry of this sort the preaching office would be regarded as subsidiary. Both these requirements, of the separated teacher and pastor, have doubtless much to commend them, just as crutches might very well appeal to a lame man. But such teachers and pastors should conceive their aim to be analogous with that of the doctor and the schoolmaster. It is the duty of the doctor to make himself unnecessary; so to aim at restoring the health of his patient that his patient may henceforth enjoy good health without his continued assistance. It is the duty of a schoolmaster so to teach his pupils that henceforth they may no longer require his assistance. It is the duty, and it will be the aim, of the true minister, in like manner to eliminate himself, to render himself unnecessary by promoting his people to spiritual autonomy. Is this aim being sought? Is it being achieved with any measure of success?

(ii) The strength of any church, here and now, is the strength of its laity. There are still places where congregations gather in thousands to hear a preacher. Once upon a time that was the regular order of the day. But the tooth of time made itself felt in one way and another—a subject of larger proportions than can be discussed at the moment. There are still a few places where the vast concourse of worshippers may be found. But is such a spectacle a sign of spiritual health in the worshippers? When the preacher goes, they too are apt to disappear. It has been said that the best and most conscientious preachers have not gathered congregations and been content so to do; they have been concerned to build up a Church—a task undoubtedly more tedious. When the preacher who has built a Church is taken away, the Church he has built remains. It is strong, because its laity is strong.

(iii) The spreading of Christianity is primarily an individual and private task. Secondarily it may be a public one, but in the first place the evangelism must be personal. A Church whose members had each the marrow of the matter in them would be unable to help themselves. They would accost their fellow men without ceasing from day to day, and this they would do, and will do, not boorishly, nor rudely, nor presumptuously, but humbly, and with a simple witness. "Let the redeemed of the Lord say so", pleads the old writer. But the redeemed of the Lord cannot help saying so. They would "the precious time redeem, And longer live for this alone". An engine-driver who had been converted asked how he might

start on some Church work. "What is your job?" asked his spiritual adviser. "An engine driver", he replied. "Then you will begin with your stoker tomorrow morning".

How sadly have we missed the mark. How urgently do our minds need to be disabused. We have thought and presumed that our work was done when we had engaged others to do it. It is work which can never be done unless we do it ourselves, the simple gladsome work of telling others. There is an oft-told tale which will perhaps bear one more repetition. Pious legend reports that Gabriel went forth to greet the Christ Who was returning to the Heavens after His peerless victory on earth. Said the Archangel to the Saviour, "What precautions have you taken to ensure that the good news will be carried round the world?" "I have told Peter and John and the others". . . . "But suppose they fail, or forget. Have you taken no further precautions?" "No", replied the Saviour. "I have taken no further precautions".

W. ARNOLD HALL.

A MINING VILLAGE CHILDREN'S CHURCH.

THE following details (put throughout in the past tense for convenience, although the experiment continues) of a children's church at a small Congregational Church in a Staffordshire mining village may be of interest, as embodying some variations from the usual town pattern.

The congregation met for worship only once on a Sunday, at 6 p.m. There was a two-department afternoon Sunday School with 6 teachers and 50 scholars. The Children's Church was designed to take the place of a morning School, consisting of 15 or 20 scholars, of all ages from 3 to 14, and under one teacher (with occasional help by one other). The services of one extra adult were obtained, giving the Children's Church two leaders.

It was noticed that children often played in the village streets in groups very much other than age groups: older children regularly looked after not only their own younger brothers and sisters but also other younger children. The Children's Church was therefore organized on a group basis—with one or two older children leading each group of three or four younger ones. The older children were designated "deacons" and met periodically—at one of the leaders' homes on a week evening, or briefly on Sunday morning after the benediction—to arrange the programme. Suggestions were made by the leaders, but the deacons' decisions were final; it was made clear from the start that leaders would not exercise any veto. Several of the deacons were allotted (by vote) to particular jobs. The younger members became deacons at about the age of ten, with the approval of the existing diaconate.

The proceedings on Sunday usually included an address, generally by one of the leaders, but sometimes by one of the deacons—always, however, a story intended to appeal to the younger members. Deacons took turns at arranging and conducting the whole of the rest of the proceedings. Prayers were sometimes read from a pre-arranged source (*e.g.*, the Ealing Green Little Church Book) or from a leader's typescript or the reader's own manuscript. There was usually some expression work (crayons, plasticine) done in groups, each deacon supervising his own group. Several special projects were carried through—for instance, the Livingstone Centenary was celebrated by a series of playlets, one by each of the groups, depicting various scenes from the life of Livingstone, and rehearsed on three previous Sundays.

The deacons were exercised to find a satisfactory version of the Bible in

language sufficiently simple to be understood at a hearing by the younger children. They also appointed a sub-committee to find a better hymnbook than the one in use, and to arrange the finance of its purchase. (The result, *Songs of Praise*, while not ideal, can be corrected by the addition of hymns—notably of Watts—from the *Congregational Hymnary* from time to time.)

Weeknight activities were not a necessary part of the scheme, but an avacuee dramatics lecturer conveniently arrived in the village, and did good work by getting the children together to rehearse for several dramatic performances.

Suitable opportunities were taken to introduce older deacons into the pews on Sunday evenings; it appeared that the leakage was likely to be less than is often the case between Sunday School and Church.

It should be added that the premises consisted of a room of suitable small size, well lit, and not furnished in any way calculated to impose any artificial atmosphere or feeling of reverence in the young worshippers, who were therefore under temptation neither to divorce their spiritual from their everyday experiences nor to regard Almighty God as a super-schoolteacher objecting to their natural noisy activity.

J. W. ASHLEY SMITH.

ADVICES FOR DAILY LIVING¹

1. Do you respect that in you which is of God, so that his power may grow in you and may rule over your lives?

Do you seek to follow Jesus, who shows us the Father and teaches us his way?

2. Is your religion rooted in spiritual experience and does it find expression in your life?

Are you faithful in your testimony for the freedom and spirituality of Christ's gospel?

3. Do you live in the love which Christ felt for us?

Do you nourish in yourselves the spirit of forgiveness?

Are you concerned about the reputation of others and do you oppose gossip and the maligning of others?

Do you endeavor, impartially, to overcome mounting discord at the right time and in the spirit of Christ?

4. Are you on guard against the inclination towards ease and indolence?

Does any external desire claim too much of your time and energy, so that it becomes a hindrance to your growth in the grace and in the service of God?

5. Do you come conscientiously to our meetings for worship, heart and mind prepared? Are you growing towards a true fellowship?

Are you obedient to the command of God, whether your worship be in words or in silence?

6. Are your meetings eager to recognize their tasks? Does each one of you take upon himself his fair part in the attendance and cooperation at meetings, so that the burden does not rest with a few?

7. Have you, in your daily lives, a place for contemplation and waiting for God, so that you come to know the full meaning of prayer and the joy of communion with him?

[¹We have obtained permission from the *Friends' World News* to reprint this selection from the *Advices*, which are edited by the German Quakers and translated by an American student.]

8. Do you strive to make your home a place of friendliness, comfort and harmony, where God becomes more real to all who live with you and visit you?
9. Do you, as a group, care lovingly for the children and youth with the desire that they may grow in the knowledge and devotion to Jesus Christ?

Do you create opportunity for every one to take part in life and in the activities of the group?

10. Do you work to develop your spiritual energies and to use them for God's honor?

Are you faithful to the truth and do you keep your minds open for new light, wherever it may come from?

11. Are you absolutely honest in business and in all your relations with others?

Do you take conscientious care to commit no fraud with public money?

12. Do you preserve the spirit of righteousness and of understanding in your relations with your fellow workers and employees in industry, commerce and in all your daily life?

13. What place does the service for others occupy in your lives? Are you attending to it in the spirit of friendship?

14. Are you living in the power that removes the cause of all war?

Sir William Beveridge's *The Pillars of Security* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) contains nineteen papers or addresses dating from February, 1942, to March, 1943. With one or two exceptions, such as the paper on "The Massacre of the Jews", all of them deal with aspects of the problem of social security, and most of them with the Report which bears Sir William's name. Here the contents of that Report are outlined—the summary withdrawn by the Army Bureau of Current Affairs is printed—and Sir William's replies to criticisms stated. Here, too, are munitions for all engaged in the campaign against the giants of Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor, and Idleness. The Beveridge Report crystallized the hopes and aspirations of the common people of this country, and it is well that these papers have been collected. With the circulation they should have a shilling edition should be possible.

Mr. G. D. H. Cole's *Fabian Socialism* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) presents his own view, and not that of the Committee of the Fabian Society, of which he is Chairman. It contains seven chapters, written in the competent style of which Mr. Cole is master; they are easy to read, and some of them—"Basic Socialism", for example, are very convincing. Mr. Cole argues that propaganda for Socialism cannot wait until after the War, and that the immediate task is "to recreate the Socialist movement as an ethical faith and not merely as the expression of an economic preference for one form of social organization over another". In discussing the movement towards democracy he finds the *sine qua non*, in industry and in social life, to be small groups—"small enough for everyone to know, or to be able to know, everyone else personally . . . we must set out to build our new society upon little democracies of neighbours as well as upon little democracies of workers". These are the congregational churches, cells, or groups we have long been advocating!

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

THE ISLAND AGAIN.

ONCE again I have been asked to play the desert island game. I do not remember how many years it is since I did so, but a correspondent asks, "What twelve books would you choose if you were to be wrecked on a desert island *now*?" Well, that is the sort of question one likes to ponder when the day's work is done, though today I spent a long bus ride thinking about it. I first decided I should like to know more about the conditions—how long I was likely to be marooned, and whether I should have salvaged a portable wireless set from the wreck. The length of time would determine the selection, while the presence or absence of a wireless set would reduce or increase the hours spent with the books.

I am presuming that the question implies that I should be a solitary Robinson Crusoe, without the resources of modern civilization, with many hours on my hands—and I have made my choice accordingly. I am doing this *de novo*, without referring back to my last choice. It will be interesting to compare the results.

1. It is not convention that makes me put *the Bible* first. I know no book so rich in human interest. In it you have history and biography, travel and adventure, poetry and prose, philosophy and theology, and a little book which has been called "the most beautiful love story in the world". And there is so much I want to know about the Bible. In recent weeks I have been copying the writings of the early Independents, and their knowledge of the Scriptures has often put me to shame. They believed, of course, not only that the Bible was the rule of life, but that it contained the pattern for the organization of the life of the Church to the smallest detail—and they knew their Bibles inside out. If on the island I could become as well acquainted with the Old and New Testaments as they were, the wreck would have been well worth while. And I should have the advantage that I should read the *Apocrypha* too, which they were inclined to despise, and which they would not have read publicly in church.

2. The second book too chooses itself—Shakespeare. Just as I marvel at the richness of the Bible, the work of many men, so I marvel at these plays, the work of one man. Has anybody, except the One who knew what was in man, had such insight into human nature? And where else is there such matchless music? As the weeks went by without the sound of human voice I am sure that I should often read aloud from my cherished No. 2.

3 & 4 *almost* choose themselves—the poems of Milton and Wordsworth. There are poor benighted souls—like the Archbishop of Canterbury—who can't read Milton, but I find delight in him, and specially in *Paradise Lost*. And I'm sure that when my mind was restless and perturbed I should pick up Wordsworth, if only to bring Lakeland back to my mind.

5 & 6 I know will not be in my last list, for they are comparatively recent books—the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* and the *Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*. I wrote about both of them when they were published, and so I say no more about them, except that I'm sure they would be good stand-bys.

7 would certainly be the one volume *Dictionary of National Biography*. My mind would often be wandering back, and I should want to check

dates and details, and it would be comforting to have this ever useful reference book at hand.

8. Macaulay's *Essays*, especially in the edition which contains the *Lays*, for when I tried to declaim "Horatius" I should want to make sure I hadn't forgotten it. The *Essays* cover so much ground, and are invariably provocative, while the style I always find invigorating; I'm sure I should never regret this choice.

As one draws to the end, personal tastes begin to count for more and more. My 11 and 12 had been pretty clear all along, though I have tried to pretend they were not: they would be *Bradshaw* and the latest full volume of *Wisden*. "What a waste!" some of my readers will say. But I am sure there would be nothing like them for nostalgic spells. I always enjoy working out train journeys, and *Bradshaw* would be a geography as well as a reminder of home. With *Wisden*, it would give me hope of future days when I should be in the train again, and of halcyon hours in the sun at Lord's or Leeds, or reading Neville Cardus trying to be fair to Yorkshire when they were inflicting the usual defeat on Lancashire at Whitsuntide or August Bank Holiday. But 9 and 10—they are my great problem. After long thought I have decided that

9 must be *Julian*, only I hope the wreck will not occur until after the new edition is published. *Julian* also is so rich: rich in history and in human appeal—and to have many hymns suggested if not quoted would be a boon.

10. Now the pressure increases. Something would depend on the books I had read in the weeks before the trip. If I had recently read *The Pilgrim's Progress* or *The Pickwick Papers*, reviving my memory so that I could reconstruct them fairly fully, they would be left out. Otherwise I should be tempted to include one or the other. Assuming they are reluctantly rejected, what should be done? A book of prayers or some devotional book? I think not. I have the Bible. *Whitaker's Almanac* or *The Times Book of Cross-Word Puzzles*. No: I have already enough books of reference, and if I'm driven to cross-words, I'll try to make them. But what an embarrassment of riches! I reach out to Boswell. No, there is Matthew Arnold. No, Charles Lamb's essays. I've nothing by a woman, but I reject in turn Charlotte, Mrs. Gaskell, and George Eliot, and don't consider Jane. I've no volume of *Letters*, and several tempt me. So does Newman because of his prose. I'd like something about my heroes, Cromwell and Lincoln, but decide even against them. Browning? I decide I know the Shorter Poems sufficiently well to rely on memory. Wells's *Outline of History* is handled several times. It covers a lot of ground: but it is a bundle of prejudices, and I should find it aggravating, and therefore leave it behind. Finally I decide it must be a volume of plays—Barrie, Galsworthy, Shaw—and Shaw has it because he is so stimulating, and as I read I want to hear Sybil Thorndike's voice in *St. Joan*.

So there it is. How I give myself away, and how the critics will scorn. No modern poetry—how I date myself. No science—though I did think of reviving my youth with some mathematics. And how very insular—no Goethe, Dante, *Don Quixote*, Dostoevsky! No Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Virgil! The man's a Philistine.

And horror of horrors! I find there is no THEOLOGY! A meeting of College Principals is hastily convened. Principal and President, with all proper ritual—not the Salisbury use, but a strange hybrid of Aquinas and Calvin—bring bell, book, and candle, and a motion that I be solemnly cut off is duly moved. But evidence as to character having been given by the Editorial Board, clemency prevails, and, on condition that I

put myself under instruction, I am put on probation. Meanwhile I'm safe enough here and enjoying my exile and my twelve books—and as I have wisely not brought any of my own writings with me I cannot compare the twelve with my previous choice.

ALBERT PEEL.

A CRICKET NOTE.

THE sparrows have gone from Lord's, and barrage balloons are not a sufficient compensation; but the barrage balloons will go, and the sparrows will return, and there will be cricket again. It was the cricket of the future that drew me to Lord's on May 29th, to the first war-time game I had seen, for young players were on view who, if they escape the cruel hand of war, should play a great part in the game. There was another attraction too: Leary Constantine was leading a West Indies side against an England XI, and he and a lovely summer's day gave Lord's almost a peace-time appearance, with 20,000 people on the seats.

Truth to tell, the cricket was not very good. The batsmen were clearly out of practice; and as Wilfrid Rhodes once said to me, "It's being aht i' t' middle ivry day as does it". A. V. Bedser bowled well, though his analysis (6 for 27) was flattered by the woefully weak West Indian batting. Ames had two men who have bowled for England, Edrich and Wright, but he did not need to call upon them. Only C. B. Clarke, who has been playing regularly, batted with skill; his arms seemed stiff, but perhaps that is only because he makes his strokes very late. Constantine, to everybody's intense disappointment, was out for a single, *lbw* from a wild stroke; he received a great welcome, not the less because of his frankness at a recent Brains Trust, but he returned to the pavilion amid gloom that could be felt. The West Indian batting exhibited the features we know so well—rashness in strokes and in running, general impatience, and a too obvious resentment of the umpire's decisions. The Colonial problem, that of giving responsibility to a people still unrestrained and childlike, is exemplified invariably when one sees the West Indians at cricket.

They were as delightful as ever in the field; Constantine pounced and threw in as aforetime, but he misfielded several balls; he no longer bowls fast, and it seems that even he must yield to *Anno Domini*. Robertson and Halliday, who opened the English innings, may, we are told, one day open for England in reality. Robertson, though badly missed when 22, scored a neat, competent 80, constantly bringing young J. T. Hearne to mind; he will certainly be a claimant for England's No. 1. Halliday showed us the face of the bat, but he was bowled by a beautiful break-back from Constantine when 7, and it remains uncertain whether the young Yorkshireman will be Sutcliffe's successor. Another young player was T. E. Bailey, who not only bowled well, but let us see some of the most confident batting in the match; he must certainly be watched. Edrich batted as he does for England and not for Middlesex, and Ames had one of those innings he has played so often—scratching about and looking most uncomfortable for the first half-hour, and then suddenly bringing some masterly strokes out of the bag. After I left Ames sent the West Indies in again, and the crowd had some fireworks from Leary.

So keep an eye on Robertson, Bailey, Bedser—and take heart because Lord's is still there; so is the clock, and at 1.55 we still say, "They'll soon be coming now"; perhaps even by next summer the sparrows will be back and the balloons gone—let us hope for ever.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

WHERE, then, is the moral theology of to-day? The only possible answer is that communism provides the moral theology appropriate for our time. The fact that a doctrine of God is apparently absent from it is unimportant in this connection; what it does is to lay down the ideal rules for the relations between man and man, to affirm that the exploitation of one class by another is immoral, that national wars for markets are immoral, that the oppression of subject and colonial races is immoral, that the unequal distribution of goods, education, and leisure is immoral, that the private ownership of the means of production is immoral. It dares to take the "love of our neighbour" literally; to ensure that by the abolition of privilege each single citizen shall have the fullest opportunities to live the good life in a community of free and equal colleagues. It continues and extends the historic work of Christianity for woman, setting her on a complete equality with man. Its concept of leadership is leadership from within, not from above. Only because Christian theology three centuries ago gave up the attempt to apply a very similar ethic to human affairs has this state of things come about.

JOSEPH NEEDHAM, *Time: The Refreshing River*.

But if secularist propaganda, by emphasizing the need for a change of system and by failing to emphasize simultaneously the need for a conversion of personal motive, has weighted the balance unduly on the optimistic side, there is no doubt that the theologians have erred grievously in the opposite direction. Orthodox insistence on the sinfulness of man has been pushed in some schools to the limits of despair, and accordingly bares itself to criticism on its own ground, that is to say, from the religious angle. For the pessimist is in fact saying that the prayer "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth" is a vain yearning. This warped religious attitude which many contemporary Christians betray, when they express their scepticism of what socialism will achieve, stands out in sharp contrast to the teaching and action of Jesus. Nothing is more conspicuous in his life than his belief in the potentialities for good of human nature. It was his faith in the essential goodness of man that gave faith to those who sought to be healed. Catholic hopelessness as to the possibilities of human achievement seems to be contradicted directly by the promise "he that believeth in me the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do because I go unto the Father".

KENNETH INGRAM, *Taken at the Flood*.

Yet it is still possible, and even necessary, in a democratically planned society that the question of conscience should come alive whenever one decides on the acceptance of a new plan, or whenever one feels responsible for its being put into practice after the decision has been taken. In this sense it is very likely that the crucial tests for the individual conscience will not always, as in the past, be found in the little decisions of our everyday activities, but in our taking the responsibility for decisions concerning the social order at large. That means that in the past it was not quite impossible to say: "As long as I am a fairly good Christian in my private life, in my personal relationships, I need not worry too much about the social

and political order in which I live''. This attitude will become entirely impracticable in a society in the stage of planning, because there the organization of the framework of society to a large extent determines what is possible in private relationships. If society is planned not for freedom but on totalitarian lines, complete withdrawal into the parochial and personal world is virtually impossible. Thus the social organization becomes more than ever a matter of personal conscience. One cannot be a good Christian in a society where the basic rules are against the spirit of Christianity. If it was already true in Tolstoy's day, who said that serfdom was anti-Christian not only because it compelled the serf to remain sub-human but also because it compelled the landlord to behave as a non-Christian, it is even more true to-day when there are no private nooks and corners which remain unaffected by the prevailing principles of social organization.

KARL MANNHEIM, *Diagnosis of our Time.*

Great Britain has in this matter a special part to play, owing to the famous English way of looking at things. Since the days of Henry the Eighth England has not respected the authority of the Pope. Who has taken his place? The paper Pope, that is, the Bible, was a candidate for the succession, but it did not succeed. Instead there came the "British attitude", the religion of tolerance and decency, of Humanism and Civilization, the preference for a natural theology which can be found in all religions; and Unitarianism, although actually only the creed of some of the intellectually-minded, has become the religion of English public opinion. Now all this implies a certain scepticism. I had to wait until I had lived in this country for three years before I realized the scepticism latent in British Christianity. For centuries there has been little burning concern with the question of Truth. It is even admitted here that people are Christian only in a diffused sense. The rest of Europe, when it turned its back on the Papacy, erected a new authority, which was not a paper Pope. To have neither of these two Popes, to live with belief in jeopardy, without any sort of guarantee, this is the way of the Reformation. Security is guaranteed by the two Popes, but certainty without a guaranteed security is something conferred by the Word of God through faith. It was precisely on this foundation that the Confessional Church was able to begin the struggle. It is precisely on this foundation, too, that your theology is built, and that is why we understand you, in spite of the extreme difficulty which this involved.

HANS P. EHRENBERG, *Autobiography of a German Pastor.*

. . . since the outbreak of war such theology as has been produced has been plainly pathological. . . . [Its writers] are bound to emphasize the universality and power of evil, until Christianity becomes a message not of salvation, but of the Fall, . . . and until an exaggerated enthusiasm exalts the strange and diseased genius of Kierkegaard into the place of the most profound Christian theologian. The Church's faith in the Holy Spirit, the Pauline emphasis upon good news and charity and fellowship, the message of the Johannine Prologue, indeed all the characteristic passion and power of the religion of the New Testament have disappeared. In their places such writers give us only the doleful news that 'the world is very evil: the Church has always known it'. And this is not the gospel—or even its proper prelude.

C. E. RAVEN, *Science, Religion, and the Future.*

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.)

Vernon Faithfull Storr. By G. H. HARRIS. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Here we have a brief biography of one of the most attractive figures in the Church of England of our day. Vernon Storr was essentially "sound"; he knew what he believed, and could give reasons for it; at the same time he was ready to accept new light from whatever quarter it came. As leader of the Liberal Evangelicals in the Church of England he did fine work, his gifts as teacher being allied with a fine spirit which made him *persona grata* everywhere. No man refused preferment oftener, no man deserved it more. He knew the limitations his health and his tastes laid upon him, and he had the courage and wisdom to obey them. He will no doubt be best remembered for his work at Westminster, where, both at the Abbey and at St. Margaret's, he made a notable contribution, but this book scarcely does credit to the greatness of his character. His attitude to truth and to life is one which must become characteristic of Christians if the Church is to live. Mr. Harris says:

Religion without freedom was for him unthinkable. No strain is more constant throughout his writing than his insistence upon the freedom which derives from the teaching of Jesus; he realized that true freedom in religion was something new in Christianity. The cardinal importance of Christian freedom covers the whole of his teaching, directly, or by implication. If freedom is lost, forbidden or restricted, then religion is losing its meaning and power; and until the sense of liberation for mind and spirit has become an individual experience, the full enrichment of religion has not been felt. . . . The liberal evangelical takes as his motto "The truth shall make you free"; but by truth he means, not something static, a crystallised deposit of beliefs, but a moving and growing whole of knowledge, which man has progressively to appropriate and make his own. We shall reach the truth only if we search for it. A quest is involved, and if the quest is to be an honest one, the seeker after truth must be ready to follow wherever truth leads him. He must not come to his inquiry with his conclusions already formed, merely seeking for evidence which may confirm these conclusions. He cannot, indeed, come without some presuppositions or some conclusions already tentatively reached, but he must come with as open a mind as possible, and with the readiness to revise his prior opinions if occasion arises to make him do so. One of the marks of liberal evangelicalism is its willingness to welcome new knowledge from whatever quarter it comes.

Storr made a point about the Church of England which is often forgotten when he noted that no inquiry was made into the beliefs of its members after Confirmation:

They are left entirely free to believe what they will and to express their beliefs. Their right to full membership in the society is never

questioned on grounds of supposed unorthodoxy. If they choose to recite the Creed in public worship with mental reservations, none can say them nay. The question is whether a like freedom can be granted to the clergy who are officers of the society, into which official position they were admitted only after they had solemnly affirmed that they were in general agreement with the doctrinal basis of the society. . . . Surely the important matter is whether the officer of the Church can give "a religious valuation of the facts" which is genuinely in line with the traditional belief. . . . The maximum of liberty should be conceded. Happily the situation to-day is very different from what it was a generation ago. The battle for freedom has been largely won.

Again, Mr. Harris says:

There is a vagueness about liberal evangelicalism when compared with other schools in the Church; but it is the vagueness inherent in the teaching of Christ Himself. It arises from the fact that it is always the principle, the idea that is vital, and that these life-centres must needs assume new forms in a changing world. Like the New Testament as a whole, we have no final statement to offer which can compare with the complete and closed formulas of Catholicism. "Idea and Institution; Spirit and Form—there is always a tension between the two; not only in matters religious but everywhere, in politics, in the realm of social change, in literature, as witness the break-away from the classical tradition under the impulse of the Romantic Movement. Spirit must embody itself in form; and the idea must have institutional expression. But always the danger is that the form shall stifle the spirit, and the institution crush the idea. That process can be seen going on all down history. And when the tension becomes intolerable, then there comes some revolution, or violent change, resulting in a break with the past. Spirit is always more potent than form; idea is always larger than institutional expression. Primacy belongs to spirit and idea. The creative, vital thing is the idea. There would never have been the institution, if the idea had not been behind it craving realisation in external shape. Now liberal evangelicalism emphasises the primacy of spirit and idea, and is always on the watch lest any outward embodiment of organisation, or rule and order, should usurp the place which rightfully belongs to what is inward".

We have made these citations because it has seemed to us that of all movements of our time Liberal Evangelicalism has best caught the spirit of Jesus Christ. To quote Storrs again:

The man who builds himself a house naturally occupies the house, and has a fixed abode. The man who is on the march and travels with a tent camps in different places. But this does not mean that he is an aimless wanderer. He is bound for a goal; the general direction of his advance is clear; but he wishes to reach his goal as quickly as may be, and so travels light. A progressive theology must allow for fresh developments in the future. If theology becomes static it inevitably dooms itself to sterility in a moving world. But theology may be progressive and yet have definite underlying truths and principles which it seeks to expound. Liberal evangelicalism has a very definite theology and a definite Gospel to preach. It is the old Gospel of redemption through the Cross and sanctification through the Holy Spirit. It is fundamentally of the same texture as the older evangelicalism. . . . The evangelicalism of the future in this country, and indeed the world over, will be something different from the evangelicalism of the past.

It will have a wider vision, a greater sensitiveness to the moving currents of the world's life. It will be something more comprehensive and with a greater tolerance for ways of thought and organization different from its own. It will be more "on the move", more eager to mount its watch-tower and listen to what God has to say. But it will remain evangelicalism, with its love of liberty, its message of the soul's right of free access to God without intermediary, its acceptance of the Cross as the pledge and power of salvation, its relegation of questions of ecclesiastical organization to a secondary place.

If any religious teacher of our day had a message more relevant to our times than Vernon Storr, we have yet to find him.

EDITOR.

Communion in the Messiah: Studies in the Relationship between Judaism and Christianity. By LEV GILLET. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

The author is a priest of the Russian Orthodox Church, who has had close personal contact with many Jews, and writes in warm sympathy with them, and in full appreciation of the Jewish contribution to religion. His aim is to bring Judaism and Christianity into a better understanding of each other, chiefly through the mutual study of essential faith and underlying principle. He does not, by any means, confine himself to the *O.T.* basis of Christianity, but includes rabbinical and mystical developments within Judaism, especially the work of Martin Buber, of whom he says, "No name is more important for knowledge and appreciation of modern Judaism" (218). Of the conception of the Shekinah he remarks, "This idea is probably the shortest and best established bridge between the two faiths" (65).

The fruit of this better understanding would be the fulfilment of the Pauline "mystery of Israel" (*Rom.* 11²⁵), as to which it is said, "The letter to the Romans should be the basis of all Christian approach to Judaism" (211). This takes him, of course, beyond any merely humanitarian relations. He regards Israel as having a great and permanent part yet to play in the purpose of God. Israel has a mission to Christianity, as well as Christianity a mission to Judaism. The goal of this two-fold mission would be a new unity in the Messiah, a fellowship reached by the mutual discovery of a common relation to Him, leaving room, apparently, for differences of interpretation within the common loyalty. (This is not taken to imply any abatement of the orthodox Christian claims in regard to Jesus.) The practical working out of this fulfilment includes a "spiritual" Zionism (already in process in Palestine), and the development of a Jewish Christianity which would contribute a necessary element to the future oecumenical consciousness of the Church (209).

The thesis is worked out in considerable detail on the theological side, and there is much in regard to the post-canonical developments of Judaism which is interesting and informative. How far the author's optimism is likely to be justified, each must judge for himself. It might be argued that the spiritual continuity of Israel's mission could be fulfilled without the writer's emphasis on the nationalistic aspects of Judaism. But there is no doubt that the sympathetic outlook, the wide knowledge of the literature, the honest recognition of the difficulties in the way of this ambitious programme, make the book attractive. As an *eirenicon*, we should judge that it will appeal to Christians rather than to Jews. Special mention should be made of the useful notes given as an appendix to the volume. The proof-reading has been carelessly done.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. By GEORGE JOHNSTON. Cambridge Press. 10s. 6d.

Once again a Scots manse has furnished us with a first-class piece of work. Under the unerring guidance of the late Canon Creed and Prof. Dodd, Dr. Johnston has filled a gap in biblical theology by this comprehensive and thorough-going treatise. There have been notable contributions to the subject in smaller compass, one especially by Prof. Dodd himself, but I do not recall anything on the same scale as this. Proceeding from a luminous survey of the environment of the Early Church, both Græco-Roman (with its Guilds and Mystery Cults) and Judaistic (especially the synagogue and the various parties), the author gives us a valuable disquisition on the meaning of *ecclesia*, and passes on to pre-Pauline conceptions. In the chapter on Jesus and the Church he lays down the principle that the term *ecclesia*

should be reserved for the society which gathered itself into a vital fellowship as a result of the resurrection, inspired and called by God, *i.e.*, historically its existence dates from either Easter or Pentecost, not from "the days of His flesh". Having considered the primitive community, Dr. Johnston discusses with appropriate fullness and ability the Pauline doctrine of the Church—its setting in Paul's theology, the Church as the people of God, the Body of Christ and the incarnating of the Holy Spirit. With the same thoroughness he handles the story of the doctrine in the sub-apostolic age and rounds off his task with two appendixes, one on the authenticity of *Ephesians* in which he largely shares Goodspeed's opinion, the other on a technical point of Syriac terminology.

It is gratifying to find that this new and penetrating study of the subject reinforces the position taken up a generation ago in Hort's *Christian Ecclesia* and sees in the Church of the N.T. an inspired fellowship of believers rather than a caste of clerics. It is even more gratifying to note the emphasis on the unity, the universality, and especially the world mission, of the Church. This is something more than a scholarly treatise which will bear frequent re-reading; it is a call to action.

The documentation is overwhelming; there are pages (*e.g.*, 109) where every sentence has a reference, some of them more than one. And it is perhaps a refinement of criticism to decorate *Ephesians* and *Eph.* with inverted commas. Books produced under war conditions may have some defects, but if all theological treatises took up as little room as this there would be less shelving needed and—I speak feelingly—the transport of a library would be infinitely easier.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Virgin Birth in History and Faith. By DOUGLAS EDWARDS, C.R. Faber. 12s. 6d.

The Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, reporting in 1938, was content to admit diversity of opinion on this question. About the same time Mr. Edwards, feeling like a man in duty bound "to clear the reputation of a friend assailed by slander", sat daily for weeks on end with palpitating heart in the British Museum to study the case against the Virgin Birth. Out of this travail has come this book whose conclusions are: (1) "that there is no particle of evidence against the Virgin Birth that would not be dismissed at once if put before an impartial and instructed jury"; (2) that belief in it is an article of a standing or falling Christian faith—if you don't believe it you are no Christian.

Neither the sincerity nor the painstaking labour of the author is in question. But there runs through the whole work not only a wearisome

strain of repetition, but a certain browbeating attitude. This is focused generally on Dr. Vincent Taylor (who in a book on the same subject spoke of the comparative silence of the *N.T.* regarding it); and specifically on the late Canon Creed for saying in his Commentary on *Lk.* that while "the idea of conception without a human father was unknown in orthodox Judaism it was widely prevalent in the ancient world, and when the church moved out into the Hellenistic world it would be very natural that cognate ideas concerning the manner of the conception of Jesus (stripped of gross notions of divine paternity) should find a lodgment".

Mr. Edwards pours scorn on those whom he calls *soi-disant* literary critics as opposed to historians, among whom he ranks himself. But a little more literary scholarship would have prevented him from mistranslating *1 Cor.* 10²¹. His standpoint is revealed again when he speaks of the Corinthian "clergy" of the first century, and in the emphasis he puts upon the "apostles". It would be a salutary exercise for him as a historian to investigate this latter subject. Who were these "apostles" on whom so heavy a load is placed? What do we know of a *certainty* about any of them and their teaching, beyond Peter and Paul?

To return to the immediate question. It is high time that we recognized that the first two chapters of *Mt.* and *Lk.* are not factual history but poetry. As such they have a truth as well as a beauty of their own, but it is not a material truth. The story of the birth of Jesus has an exact analogy in *O.T.* where the Hebrew writers took over the Babylonian stories of the Creation and the Flood, and, purging them of their crudity and grossness, transformed and sublimated them. "The notion of a Virgin Birth", to borrow some words from the Archbishops' Commission's Report, "tends" (in the opinion of some) "to mar the completeness of the belief that in the Incarnation God revealed Himself at every point in and through human nature". For a proof-text see *Heb.* 2¹⁴⁻¹⁷. Mr. Edwards takes exactly the opposite view, and I suppose the divergence will continue.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Johannine Theology. Christianity according to St. John. By W. F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D. Duckworth. 6s.

There is only one reservation I feel bound to make in a confident and cordial recommendation of this book: a brief summary of the author's conclusions on the authorship, the literary character, and the historical value of the Gospel would have been helpful to the reader's clearer understanding and fuller appreciation of the exposition of the theology; it is treated as a system, but what is lacking is an indication of what parts in it may be regarded as reminiscences of the teaching of Jesus, complementary to the Synoptic records, and what parts as reflections of the "beloved disciple" under the guidance of the Spirit of truth. Only a few matters of special interest can be mentioned, valuable as all the chapters are. The author recognizes more fully than he did in his previous book that "the Johannine writings are essentially Jewish in the background and texture of thought", but at the same time he cites the parallels to these Jewish in Greek ideas. This conclusion affects the detailed exposition, as it brings the theology out of an alien philosophical world of thought back into the kindred religious environment of the rest of the *N.T.* He is right, I think, in minimizing the influence of the Greek Logos doctrine, and in denying any metaphysical dualism in the Gospel. He renders a service in showing that the doctrine of human salvation through divine sacrifice has a place in the Johannine theology, if less prominent than in the Pauline. He corrects a common error in showing that the common eschatology is not

supplanted by the distinctive mysticism, but that both currents flow side by side. Very discerningly he shows that there is implicit rather than explicit in the teaching a doctrine of church, ministry, and sacraments, and that, though the word *pistis* (faith) itself is used only once in these writings, the verb to believe or trust is common, and though stress is laid on knowledge, yet the New Testament appreciation of faith is not absent. This volume will enhance the writer's high reputation as a New Testament scholar.

A. E. GARVIE.

The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. By RUDOLF OTTO. Lutterworth Press. 18s.

This book first appeared in English in 1938. It has now been revised and re-edited by Prof. Lee-Woolf, and the work could not have been in better hands. The book itself is described as "a study in the history of religion", but it is that only in so far as it deals with certain leading ideas of Jesus Christ in the light of contemporary thought and of history. For example, the first part of the book, which deals with the Kingdom of God in the preaching of Jesus, discusses at length the antecedents of that preaching—Aryan, Iranian, and Jewish, and then goes on to consider it in the light of the contemporary teaching and work of John the Baptist. From this Otto concludes:

The Kingdom of God was for Christ always the future Kingdom of the new age and was conceived on strict eschatological terms. It was to follow on the Messianic woes and the Divine judgment. But what distinguished his own eschatology from previous forms was, on the one side that he already lived in the miracle of the new age which was active even in the present: . . . on the other side, that through works, speech, parable and charismatic bestowal of power he mediated contact with this miracle of the transcendental as a private possession to a circle of adherents who came into his train.

In the second part of his book Otto deals mainly with Jesus's designation of Himself as Son of Man. This, he suggests, if it did not originate from, was largely coloured by, the idea of the Son of Man in the apocalyptic *Book of Enoch*. This he stresses to the complete neglect of *Daniel*, a much more likely source. Interesting and impressive as his argument for *Enoch* is, it does not in the end convince. The third section of the book discusses "the last supper as the consecration of the disciples for entrance into the Kingdom of God", always in the light of Otto's belief that in spite of adventitious influence "the eucharist is still a completely eschatological sacrament". The fourth and last part deals with the charismatic ministry of Jesus in relation to the Kingdom of God.

Viewing this work as a whole, one cannot but be impressed by its wide range and sweep. It contains material for many books and raises questions that require much fuller discussion. There is much that is original in it, much that is suggestive, and new light is thrown on many points of *N.T.* exegesis. But for all that there are blemishes. The shadow of Otto's wholly unethical conception of the holy as the numinous lies over the whole book. The eschatological element is over stressed, as is the Aryan influence in the teaching of Jesus, and as is *Enoch* in his thought. The Christ that stands out from these pages is a strange mixture of Rabbi, exorcist, and apocalyptic seer. Nevertheless there is much here that every serious student of the Bible should take note of. But let him keep his salt-cellar handy.

W. B. SELBIE.

Bradley's Dialectic. By RALPH WITHINGTON CHURCH, D.Phil. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

In this book Dr. Church, who is associate Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University, has set himself to expound the essence of Bradley's philosophy and to defend him against his critics. Nothing can make Bradley really easy; but Prof. Church has done his work well, and his study furnishes a valuable introduction to *Appearance and Reality*. He is better, however, in exposition than in defence.

Thought discriminates in experience, firstly qualities, and secondly relations between them. Bradley's fundamental doctrine, in which he follows Hegel, is that there are no qualities independent of relations and no relations independent of qualities. As we discriminate the qualities, relations "break out" between them, and this happens in a continuous process, by which experience is transformed into an ideal pattern of qualities in relations. Prof. Church illustrates the process from biology. An organism develops by the formation of cells through fission. We can pay attention to the cells or to their development. In a similar way does thought develop; qualities are separated out by means of relations, and we can attend either to the qualities or to the relations.

Bradley's doctrine implies the abandonment of the Aristotelian logic and the denial of its first principles, which are:—(1) The principle of identity, A is A, (2) the principle of contradiction, A is not A, (3) the principle of excluded middle, nothing can be both A and not not-A. Bradley proclaims instead the principle of *mediation*: A develops into B by evolving a difference of not-A out of itself, and by the synthesis of A and not-A in B. The principle of mediation is accepted by Bradley from Hegel. But he differs from the German philosopher in that he denies that the relational process can ever reach a conclusion. There is for him no "sphere of spheres self-closed", as there was for Hegel. On the contrary, the Absolute, *viz.*, the unity of all qualities and relations, which looms out as the goal of the process, remains always transcendent. There are only *degrees* of Truth and Reality in actual attainment, which are higher or lower according as the synthesis is wider or narrower.

From this interpretation of Bradley Prof. Church turns upon his critics. Their prime fault is that they judge him by the principles of the Aristotelian logic which he repudiates. In reality, the question is one of logic against logic. How is it to be decided? Prof. Church says that ultimately it is a matter of different experiences. If any one finds two elements absolutely alike in his experience, he will agree with Aristotle and say that A is A. But if he can find no two elements in experience absolutely alike, he will have to abandon the Aristotelian logic in favour of the Bradleian dialectic. Here the opposition is ultimate. There can be no argument on first principles.

Fichte said long ago that what kind of a philosopher a man was depended on what kind of a man he was: Prof. Church agrees with him. This result does not seem very satisfactory: it amounts to a doctrine of double or even multiple truth. No doubt our progress towards the truth is conditioned by our starting-point, but reason ought to be able to play its part.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Latchkey to Music. By J. D. M. RORKE. Oxford Press. 2s.

The Music of William Walton. By FRANK HOWES. Vol. 2. Oxford Press. 2s.

In a delightful little essay Mr. Rorke recalls how he described in his earlier book, *A Musical Pilgrim's Progress*, his own approach to gaining a

love and understanding for great music; and in this present booklet he emphasizes that every listener must find his own approach, and suggests a fruitful way by which it may be done. It would be a mistake to give away his secret in this review; we can only ask all music-lovers to get the book and to try to follow out the author's thought. This is not only a book which amateur music-lovers may read and enjoy; it is expressly designed for them alone, and can be warmly recommended.

The second of these volumes, in the well-known "Musical Pilgrim" series, deals with the compositions that have appeared in the last fifteen years, the *Sinfonia Concertante* (broadcast only a short while ago), *Belshazzar's Feast*, and the *Symphony*. The elaborate technique of modern composers does not lend itself very well to analytical notes and descriptions, and even liberal quotations in music type of the principal themes do not convey very much except to those who already know the music fairly well. However, this is a general and not a particular criticism; the difficult task of analysis has been very well done, and those already conversant with the composer's style will find much of interest and value herein.

ERIC H. THIMAN.

Catholic Art and Culture. By E. I. WATKIN. Burns, Oates. 9s.

In this Essay on the development of Christian culture Mr. Watkin distinguishes five stages:—(1) The Christian Spring, which coincides with the Autumn of classical culture; (2) the Summer of Medieval Religion; (3) the Late Summer of the disintegration of the Medieval Order in the Renaissance; (4) the Autumn of the Age of Baroque which represents the union of Classical and Gothic culture; (5) the Winter of the Modern Age, with its uncertainties due to the growing secularization of life.

He traces throughout this development a constant strain between the vertical movement of the human spirit towards God, and the horizontal movement of the mind in humanistic philosophy and science, issuing in one-sided developments of transcendentalism and immanentism respectively. The full co-ordination of the two is essential if religion is to survive in a secular-minded world. Hence the importance of the post-Reformation forms of Catholic devotion as the expression of the two-fold movement of religious culture.

Mr. Watkin writes with genuine understanding of non-Catholic points of view and raises issues which are as important for Protestant Christians as for members of his own communion.

E. J. PRICE.

THE FORWARD BOOKS.

FOR some time now a need has been expressed for something to take the place of Dale's *Manual of Congregational Principles*, Goodrich's *Primer*, and Price's *Handbook of Congregationalism*, though it is not altogether evident why at least the last of these is out of date. The new "Forward Books" (Independent Press, 2s. each) are an answer to this need on a lavish scale, perhaps too lavish, for how many busy laymen are likely to read eight booklets, with others to follow? The titles of the first four are *The Living God*, by the Rev. John Marsh, who edits the series; *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, by Dr. N. Micklem; *The Open Bible*, by the Rev. R. K. Orchard; *The Ministry*, by the Rev. John Huxtable. The authors of the second four, which are in preparation, are the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse, Dr. Lovell Cocks, Prof. H. Cunliffe Jones, and the Rev. D. T. Jenkins. About this group of names there is a definite homogeneity: two Principals, and six young men, five of them from the same college, and only two of them in pastorates; five of them are on the editorial com-

mittee of the revived *Presbyter*, and a sixth has "agreed to lend collaboration" to it. It is fair to assume that the group desires to express *The Presbyter's* brand of "Confessional and Catholic Churchmanship"; it would perhaps have been fairer to make it clear that their main desire is to appeal to the Congregational churches on behalf of such churchmanship rather than for the Congregational churches, representatively, to other communions.

Such churchmanship implies, *par excellence*, a neo-orthodoxy which it is difficult not to call uncritical. In his chapter, "We have found the Messiah", for instance, Mr. Marsh seems to accept the whole biblical story as it stands, from Virgin birth to Ascension. Elsewhere, he says,

(subject to careful historical investigation), historical events have taken place, and men have witnessed them. You may ignore, but you can't deny them. You may question the way they're interpreted, but that doesn't destroy them. The historical approach is in fact the strongest.

But the historical approach disallows any such disassociation of the events from their interpretation, which, equally, must be subject to historical investigation. And it seems equally absurd to expect that the Ascension, for example, should be accepted literally and physically today, or to pretend that it was not accepted literally and physically in the past.

Mr. Marsh needs watching for false antitheses. "The human race didn't produce or make Jesus Christ; he was God's gift"; "Christian prayer isn't something that we make; it's something that God makes in us". In each of these sentences the second and positive statements are true; but their truth does not validate the first and negative statements, which, if the doctrines of the Incarnation and of the Holy Spirit mean anything, surely are not true. Congregationalists need feel no shame at "the constantly increasing emphasis put upon the remains of God's image in fallen men", which Prof. Perry Miller has remarked as "one of the most pronounced and widespread characteristics of Puritan thought in the seventeenth century".

On another page Mr. Marsh dismisses the hymn "I think when I read that sweet story of old" as pathetic, on the ground that "We might have known him (Jesus) as a man only to miss him as a God". Apart from the strange implications of "a God", this sentence, if I may be excused for saying so, seems to me to let the cat out of the bag. For the basis of our faith in Him, most of us would rather ourselves have known Jesus in the flesh than be dependent on *anybody* else's interpretation of Him.

Dr. Micklem labours under three oppressive convictions, the first of which is that "to a considerable extent our churches and our ministers have lost their sure hold upon the Gospel". Why does Dr. Micklem keep on saying this? No one else says it (unless it be *Ilico* in the *British Weekly*). He does not support it with evidence from the *Christian World Pulpit*, but with a *priori* reasoning. He refers to "the breakdown of the traditional Calvinism, with the uncertainties introduced by the new critical study of the Scriptures", and says, "The result upon preaching was *inevitably* disastrous"; and again, "Preachers discontented with ancient formulæ and having none with which to replace them, have *inevitably* failed to build up the churches in the historic faith". The italics are in both cases mine; the implication, it should be noticed, appears to be the necessity of formulæ. Dr. Micklem quotes Dale's remark that "On the great subjects our mind is made up", and says that "a congregation that went over to Unitarianism would obviously put itself outside the great tradition"; he does not quote Dale's other remark that "a fundamental principle of Congregationalism requires that the gates of the Church should be open to a Unitarian". In

his earlier book *What is the Faith?* Dr. Micklem answers his own question with a rehabilitation of the Apostles' Creed. Does he identify this with the Gospel? Barrow called the Creed "a forged patchery". Was Barrow's hold on the Gospel inevitably loosened?

Dr. Micklem's second oppressive conviction is that "we have fallen from our own principles of churchmanship", which demand for a church's constitution the presence of a minister, with the faithful preaching of the Word and the due celebration of the Sacraments: such a conception, he says, "holds a pivotal position in our church order". This is explicitly denied by both Barrow and John Robinson, and the church of the Pilgrim Fathers in New England existed for years without either minister or sacraments. But to the charismatic Congregationalism of the Separatists, who were quite clear that the church is prior to the ministry, Dr. Micklem makes no reference.

His third trouble is that we lack the synods which he holds essential to our polity. For the importance of synods he justifiably quotes Owen and Thomas Goodwin (of whom Doddridge remarks, "I am not very fond of such mysterious men"!), but it would be interesting if he could quote examples of such synods actually held at any time in our history, other than the Savoy Conference of 1658. Dr. Micklem's argument is that "the great Church catholic is prior to the local church which is but an out-cropping"; that, while "Our local church has a faith-structure, our denomination has not"; that "Independency, as the Congregational Union now declares it in principle and modifies it in practice, is schismatical"; that it ought to be "natural for us to speak of 'the Congregational church' ", instead of 'churches', with an "organ through which to hear the voice of the Spirit as in church meeting", on the lines of the Anglican Episcopate, the Methodist Conference, and the Presbyterian Assembly. That our Assembly and County Union meetings might well be more "spiritual" is true; but that we have no such "organ" (i.e., in effect, organization) as Dr. Micklem desires is of set purpose; and it is not because "of the jealously guarded autonomy of the churches and the chaos of ideas represented by them" (note the collocation!), but because we desire to work and witness with others *as* members of "gathered" churches, not as members of an artificial "denomination" which is neither local church nor Church catholic. That our denomination has only "an expediency-structure" is therefore deliberate.

Moreover, the Separatist movement in which Congregationalism arose was of what Troeltsch calls "the sect-type" in contrast with "the Church-type"; and Troeltsch rightly insists that "the Church-type" is *not* prior to "the sect-type": "both types are a logical result of the Gospel". The claim that "the Church catholic is prior to the local church" and that present-day Independency is "schismatical" would not be surprising from an exponent of "the Church-type"; from an exponent of "the sect-type" it is, to say the least, curious. Dr. Micklem ends with a lament for the "frustration" of younger ministers, who, "if the Congregational Union has, as indeed it claims, no place in the structure of the universal church, find themselves ministers of *wholly* independent churches without *any* ecclesiastical link with the wider church". I find it difficult to see how any Congregational minister can accept the two words I have italicized. Dr. Micklem may share Mr. Marsh's fear that "The 'New Order' will extinguish us unless we become properly centralized"; but that is another matter.

The Open Bible should prove helpful to very many. Mr. Orchard shows the importance of the Old Testament both for its own sake and for understanding the New. He insists on the importance of the historical

setting, but allows religious value to myth, and explains how the meaning of both history and myth may increase as it is related to a central interpretative principle (he chooses *John* 3¹⁶) which was not originally evident. He has useful sections on the influence of the Hebrew and Greek languages on biblical thought-forms, and allows for the psychological conditioning occasioned by God's willingness "to accommodate the form of his message to the understanding of the men who first heard it". He rejects both infallible Church and infallible book:

The only final authority is that of truth, and truth cannot ultimately be externally authenticated; it cannot be "proved" by anything outside itself. Ultimately we must take responsibility for our own beliefs.

The Ministry is a much slighter booklet, with fewer pages and considerably larger print. It is written in a jaunty, avuncular style, which is not without its own effectiveness. Mr. Huxtable asks "What is a Minister?", and answers "a man of God, who preaches the word of God by which men live, and preaches it with power so that men can hear it and be persuaded by it". He describes the minister's task as "threefold: the preaching of the word; the leading of the public worship of God; the exercise of the pastoral office"; the sacraments he leaves to be dealt with in another booklet. The last chapter is called "The Minister in a Gathered Church", and is about the church meeting and the auxiliary ministry of church members. The book will be useful in explaining the Congregational ideal of the ministry to others than Congregationalists. Both it and *The Open Bible* are much more representative of Congregationalism than the first two booklets.

Paul Wernle has the dictum, "'Word and Spirit' is the motto of the Reformation". In all four of these books the emphasis falls heavily on "the Word". In "historic Congregationalism", as the authors like to call it, the emphasis has been much more upon the Spirit. Mr. Huxtable's approval of the argument that "the true apostolic succession is a succession of truth rather than of persons" may be contrasted with Cromwell's remark that "the true succession is through the Spirit". In a Congregational series the contribution on *The Holy Spirit* should be cardinal, and we await Mr. Cunliffe Jones's book with some eagerness.

Another Independent Press publication (3s.) is *The Fourth Freedom*, "Essays on Congregationalism and its enduring witness" by the Rev. L. E. Cooke, Professor G. Phillips, and the Rev. J. M. Phillips. It is interesting to read this in conjunction with the "Forward Books", as representing a considerably different emphasis from theirs. The writers deal with "The Witness of Historic Independency", "Freedom in Religious Thought", and "A Free Church in a Free World". Dr. A. J. Grieve writes a Foreword, and Dr. W. B. Selbie a postscript. These essays are brief but well worth reading. There is a straightforward air about them, suggesting the quiet mind which founded freedom brings. The following quotations will serve to show their character:

We dissent from a too narrow, too legalistic, too superstitious, too material conception of the Church of Christ. . . . We dissent, too, from all that is implied in an order of the priesthood.

Neither the Roman Catholic Church nor the Anglican Church recognizes the principle of freedom as inherent in the Gospel, and neither realizes the need for adjusting its constitution to express its faith in the freedom and responsibility of the individual believer.

The Spirit of God operates in and through the liberty of the people of God. Hence the imposition of a structure of external authority

upon the Church of Christ seems to us, as to our fathers, a humiliation, and a usurpation of the sole right of the Divine Spirit.

The changes which confront us in our organization to make our witness and work effective will come not by despising Independency and hankering after connexionalism, but by realizing that true Independency means the strong unity in Christ of men whom He has set free.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)

Mr. Harold R. Willoughby's *The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface* (Chicago & Cambridge Univ. Presses, 6s.) is a fascinating monograph on the Great Bible, with descriptions of its printing and its title-page, and a facsimile of Cranmer's Preface.

Canon Geoffrey Allen always writes freshly, and his *The Theology of Missions* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) should be read by all Christians and carefully pondered by all those with any responsibility for missionary work. His statement of the views of Drs. Kraemer and Reichelt is clear and useful, and his description of a theological college in China in which Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists unite should shame colleges at home into union.

Dr. C. E. Raven illustrates in his own person the fact that science and religion are not incompatible. In both fields he has made notable contributions to learning, and the lectures in **Science, Religion, and the Future* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.), written in a fine spirit, are certainly stimulating. Not that Dr. Raven is not a doughty fighter; his strictures on many theologians and scientists are often severe; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures, e.g., are "brilliant in their rhetoric but often misleading in their generalisations" while the Brains Trust's characteristic is "bright superficiality". After showing that the conflict between religion and science did not emerge until the Victorian age, Dr. Raven asks whether we can achieve the "new Reformation" needed, and outlines "the intellectual task: integrity", "the moral task: sympathy", and "the religious task: community". A book to ponder—and enjoy.

Though Father Aloysius Roche continually annoys the reader by striving after modernity in language—Pachome is the "Very Big Noise" and the like—his *The First Monks and Nuns* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) is an informing account of monastic life, solitary and cenobitic, in Egypt, and much can be learnt from it. As others before him, Fr. Roche is beaten by *bête noire*, forgetting that *bête* is feminine, and he misspells Miss Waddell's name; but if we can overlook the slang, we cannot forgive the association of Cromwell with Rasputin.

We have enjoyed Prof. E. Allison Peers's *Spirit of Flame* (S.C.M., 6s.), largely because of the tremendous enthusiasm with which it is written, though it is to be feared that the writer's superlatives may put off people who would benefit by reading St. John of the Cross; on one page we learn "no other writer . . . has surpassed him", and that the *Dark Night* is "a masterpiece of clarity" which shows "his deep and complete understanding of human nature", etc., etc. Prof. Peers succeeds in dispelling many easy and common criticisms of his hero, and alike in the outline of his life and the exposition of his poems and prose writings his pages are very helpful. The book is well written, though one cumbrous sentence makes the reader

ask whether it was Teresa or John who entered the Carmelite Order as a simple nun!

The shelf of Bunyan books is already a long one, but Miss M. P. Willcocks retells the story so pleasantly that her *Bunyan Calling* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) deserves a place. Writers on Bunyan work under the handicap that John Brown left little new for them to discover, while the attempt to summarize *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *Grace Abounding*, *Mr. Badman*, and *The Holy War* gives rise to comparisons the reverse of flattering to any author. Miss Willcocks's narrative is the best part of her book, and she sketches in the background skilfully.

The Rev. Geraint V. Jones has done good service in translating **Autobiography of a German Pastor* (S.C.M., 6s.). Its author, Dr. Hans P. Ehrenberg, is a non-Aryan who, after serving in the War of 1914-18 and teaching in Heidelberg, turned to theology and was inducted at Bochum in the Ruhr in 1924. Prominent in the struggle against the Nazis, he was obliged to resign in 1937; after five months in a concentration camp he arrived in England in May, 1939, and has since been joined by his wife and family. In the summer of 1940 he was interned, but from 1941 he has been responsible for German services in Manchester and North-West England. Dr. Ehrenberg casts his autobiography into the form of letters—to the Gestapo, Niemoeller, his congregation, his children, his mother, his wife, Karl Barth, and to the Bishop of Chichester and others with whom he has come into contact in England. His Jewish background and his unusual experiences—there are interesting glimpses of Troeltsch and Max Weber—give his work uncommon interest, and British Christians could learn much from it. But see "Worth Noting".

Cambridge men in general and Johnians in particular will revel in the late T. R. Glover's *Cambridge Retrospect* (Cambridge Press, 6s.). Dr. Glover spent most of his working life in Cambridge, and the familiar figures of his College live again in his pages. Of the life of Dons and undergraduates he writes in that refreshing style which has made even dry bones live, but here he is dealing not with dry bones, but with living people, and calling prose and verse to his aid as he describes the idiosyncrasies that made them loved—and feared. A delightful book for a long summer's evening.

Lord Halifax and Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jun., introduce *They Were Great Americans* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), sketches of 28 "Historic Americans" by 28 "Contemporary Americans". It is safe to say that some of the "Historic Americans" will be only names, if that, to most Englishmen (do you, reader, know anything about Carl Schurz, about whom Mr. Wendell Willkie writes?), and many of the "Contemporary Americans", sad to say, are also unknown here—even the publishers have doubts how Mr. Carl Sandburg spells his name! The sketches vary from the panegyric on Cardinal Gibbons to the fine critical appreciation of Grover Cleveland by Prof. Allan Nevins and the thrilling battle story of James Lawrence (Mr. John P. Marquand). Alexander Woolcott's "Julia Ward Howe" and Mr. Stephen Vincent Benét's "Daniel Webster" are also noteworthy.

We are rather sorry Mr. H. L. Gee has forsaken the inspirational books he does so well for *American England* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), "an epitome of a common heritage", which hundreds of people without Mr. Gee's gifts could have compiled. The volume, which is illustrated, has an immense amount of ground to cover — song and speech and inventions, Pilgrim Fathers and Founding Fathers, and American London — so that at times

it becomes almost a catalogue. Of course, there is much of interest in it, and if it helps to mutual understanding Mr. Gee may be forgiven. Keen students might like to work through his pages to discover where he is fallible.

In *The Pope's New Order* (Burns, Oates, 9s. 6d.) Mr. Philip Hughes (we follow the title-page and jacket in spelling his name though the dedication says "Phillip") has provided a "systematic summary" of the social encyclicals and addresses of Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII. A full index adds to the value of a very useful compilation.

Dr. Nicolas Zernov's *The Church of the Eastern Christians* (S.P.C.K., 4s. & 2s. 6d.) will be found full of information and full of interest. There are features in the life of the Eastern Church which make special appeal to Free Churchmen—the place given to the congregation and the belief in the continued guidance of the Spirit, to give two examples, and they will do well to read what Dr. Zernov has to say about Orthodox worship and belief. Of course, it is an idealized picture, and we wish that, instead of the account of Anglican-Orthodox relationships which occupies the second half of the book, Dr. Zernov had met some criticisms. There is little indication in his pages that there are marked differences between various branches of the Orthodox Church, and few references to its wealth. When Soviet representatives in Britain are urged to press for religious freedom in Russia, they paint a picture of the Russian Church which is very different from that in these pages. Nevertheless we thank Dr. Zernov for a book from which we have learnt much.

In *Books on Russia* (Methuen, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Philip Grierson, Fellow of Caius, has provided a very useful "bibliography and guide to reading", covering the period 1917-1942. A brief note is attached to each work cited, and Appendixes deal with Soviet Literature in Translation, British Parliamentary and other Papers, and Novels about Soviet Russia. If an inquirer wants to learn about religion or education in modern Russia, or to know the best biography of Lenin, Stalin, or Trotsky, what literature is available about the Five-Year Plan, or a hundred and one other topics, Mr. Grierson's book, the product of much industry, will not fail him.

Prof. Jakob Burckhardt of Basle (1818-97) was a wise man; he wrote in 1866, "None of my lectures will ever be printed because they only come to life as lectures, and would turn out 'all wrong' in print like the underside of a carpet". Unhappily someone thought they knew better than Burckhardt himself, and so now in *Reflections on History* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) we have the translation of lectures delivered from 1868 to 1871. They are exactly what Burckhardt warned they would be—the underside of a carpet, or, if you will, dry bones, which need the lecturer's personality to bring them to life. They discuss the three powers—the State, Religion, and Culture, and the relationship between them; they reflect 19th century Europe at the time of the Franco-Prussian War, and reveal the writer as one who fears size and standardization and foresees the worship of power. The treatment is fragmentary, but there is much shrewd comment and keen observation. Here are some typical sentences:

The power of the priesthood stands as a rule . . . in direct proportion to the place in doctrine accorded to the future life and the last things.

The very religion [Christianity] whose victory was a triumph of conscience over violence set upon men's consciences with fire and sword.

. . . our assumption that we live in the age of moral progress is

supremely ridiculous when we look back on those perilous times out of which the free strength of ideal desire rises to heaven in the lofty spires of a hundred cathedrals.

We are not sure that publishers render their authors any service by such statements as that Mr. Otto Zoff's *The Huguenots* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is the first time the story has been told simply and popularly in English in one volume. Of course, it may all depend on the definition of terms, but we should say that Prof. A. J. Grant's volume in the Home University Library fills the bill. But neither that book, Prof. Grant's *History of France*, nor any other book published in England, appears in the bibliography of Mr. Zoff's book, which is a translation from the French into American, for Americans. What, we wonder, is the French translated "an intrepid magnitude" or "The present was the worse off the fact that"? We should say the translation is poor, and the book readable, with mistakes which might have been avoided had the writer known the English books—Geoffrey Baskerville's *The Dissolution of the Monasteries*, for example.

Dr. E. M. W. Tillyard's *The Elizabethan World Picture* (Chatto, 6s.) sets out to describe the most ordinary beliefs about the constitution of the world current in the Elizabethan age, and especially the idea of a cosmic order which rarely received expression because it was generally accepted. This order's three aspects—the chain of being, the set of correspondence, and the cosmic dance—are expounded in turn in a way Elizabethan students will find suggestive and serviceable. We wish Dr. Tillyard would cure himself of his affectation about commas: a string of proper names is bad enough—"the most eminent are Spenser Sidney Raleigh Hooker Shakespeare and Jonson" (almost a royal christening!), but when they are common nouns the traffic has to stop until we decide what he means.

Dr. J. T. MacCurdy's **The Structure of Morale* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) is one of the sanest books on psychology we have met, and it is good to know that its subject-matter is being given to officers. Why do men fear at one time and not another, why does morale vary from country to country, why do the attitudes of Civil Servants, Public School boys, technicians, take definite forms? On these and similar questions Dr. MacCurdy has much that is wise to say, illustrating all the time from the experience gained from these war days. "We are more afraid of dangers we imagine than those we have experienced and survived" and the specialist "knows everything about his subject except its relative unimportance" are characteristic *obiter dicta*. If you want to learn what is to be said for army drill and saluting, or how a tall-hat sent Wilson to the White House, this very readable book will tell you. It is not often the printers of the Cambridge Press slip, but we have "conscious" on p. 4.

Canon Leonard Hodgson edits *Christian Teaching about Sex* (S.P.C.K., 1s.), the work of a Committee in the Oxford Diocese. Arranged in fifty paragraphs, the pamphlet will be found specially useful for those who have to work among young people.

It is amazing what preachers can prove from the Scriptures. In *Religion and Politics* (S.P.C.K., 1s.), an address in which Canon Charles Smyth shows his detestation of all politics but his own, he refers to a University Sermon in which Canon Leonard Hodgson

demonstrated from the Scriptures the argument that it is indeed the right and the duty of an Established Church to criticise the social, economic, or political arrangements of the nation, but that a Church which is not Established has no such authority to perform the function

of a conscience for the whole community, and in fact enjoys no *locus standi* in these matters.

"demonstrated from the Scriptures" is good. We are surprised that Canon Smyth does not find in the Scriptures support for his strictures on Sir Stafford Cripps. It is a long time since we saw so blatant a Tory pamphlet written by a Churchman. It casts scorn on any support of the Left, while it says "today the public simply does not know the party politics of individual Bishops, except of two who were appointed by a Socialist Prime Minister". The public, we venture to say, has not the remotest idea which Bishops were so appointed. But if Canon Smyth will cling to his Establishment, he must support the Bishops the State provides; like many of his kind, he wants both to have his cake and to eat it.

Talks in a Free Country (Putnam, 8s. 6d.) convinces us that the essay and not the dialogue is Dr. (seven times "doctor" he tells us) W. R. Inge's true medium: the personality of the learned divine is far too powerful to keep from obtruding into the arguments of all his speakers. In the talks eight subjects are discussed, including political economy, eugenics, "ideals and idols", and some of the most urgent problems of democracy arising from the War. Long ago Dr. Inge was recognized as one of the most salutary of the gad-flies of our time, and as an octogenarian he still performs this function. Epigrams and sententious sayings abound—here are two: "In the first century dogma had not petrified"; "Churches after all are secular institutions, in which the half-educated cater for the half-converted". We hope that the "rustic moralist" will continue to observe the world, and to irritate and stimulate by making his observations public.

To our surprise we found Prof. D. W. Brogan's *The English People* (Hamilton, 10s. 6d.) hard reading, and often had to con sentences twice over. The reason for this we cannot as yet fathom—apart from our own stupidity, though we should prefer to think it is due to the author's effort to sparkle in every sentence in a book where much compression was necessary. Dr. Brogan has unusual qualifications for interpreting Britain to the United States, but probably the best service of this book will be in interpreting the British people to themselves. There is much that is salutary, while even when Dr. Brogan trails his coat, as he does very often, the resulting fight should be to the general good. On education, religion, the Empire, India, the class system, and many another topic, he brings a shrewd judgment to bear. Strangely enough, he seems to us weakest on sport, where he was strongest in his volume on America; he doesn't really understand cricket, and to take York, where the Yorkshire XI never plays and where there is both an Association football team (and most people do not call it "football" but "Soccer") and a Northern Union side, for a comparison of attendances is misleading. On the whole, however, Prof. Brogan is both reliable and courageous. How good, *e.g.*, it is to read:

It is true that the recent boom in plays, stories, anecdotes, and even in serious studies of the role of Queen Victoria has concealed the fact that she lost most of the political battles she fought, and that if she was a great woman or a great ruler we are going to be at a loss to describe St. Joan or Peter the Great. It will not do to confuse the role of Peel or Gladstone with Victoria's. Peels and Gladstones are rare; women like Queen Victoria are not rare, only they are not queens.

Though the reader may smile at the seriousness with which the Rev. Alexander Miller takes himself—he begins his encyclical, *Biblical Politics* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), by telling us when he speaks *ex cathedra* and when he does not—yet he will end by liking him. Mr. Miller's "Studies in Christian

Social Doctrine" show that while their writer is still in the meshes of the *Zeitgeist*—we have the insistence on dogma, the intrusion of Marxism, and all the rest—there are indications that he will emancipate himself, and make helpful contributions to religious life and thought. This is evident, too, in *The National Average* (Shadwell Group, 3d.), which bears his name. The Group argues that personal and group discipline of a kind to lead to social progress may be found by those who will limit their spending to the natural average income. In Britain the crude average is £85 *p.a.*: this is corrected for each individual according to family and other responsibilities, *etc.*—the scheme is carefully worked out—and the balance goes to the group's pool, and suggestions for disposing of any group surplus are made.

In the admirable "Current Affairs" series (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.) Sir Richard Livingstone has followed up his widely read *The Future of Education by Education for a World Adrift*. The present age has lost its standards, and education must restore them by making "character" its primary aim; that involves training in history and literature, with the recognition of the place of moral judgments in both. Sir Richard, we think, exaggerates the mischief of examinations, overlooking the high proportion of children who take them in their stride, but otherwise his discussion of "education for citizenship" is convincing. Would that it were generally heeded and put into practice.

When Britain gets a real Second Chamber, among the *kaloi kagathoi* assembled there Dr. A. D. Lindsay will assuredly be found, along with Dr. Ernest Barker, Sir Richard Livingstone, and one or two other certainties. *The Modern Democratic State* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) is the first volume of a Royal Institute of International Affairs survey. Beginning from "Political Theory and Operative Ideals", Dr. Lindsay examines the heritage of Western civilization and the secularization of the State, and discusses the inter-relation of ethics, politics, and economics; "Early Democratic Theories" (with full recognition of the part played by the Puritans) then come under review, and subsequent chapters are "The Nation State", "The Industrial Revolution", "The Claim of the State", "Sovereignty Restated", "The General Will", and "Democracy and the Common Life". This leaves for Vol. II the problem of democratic control, and the discussion of methods by which democracy can function in modern times. Dr. Lindsay's touch is as light as it is sure, and this sketch, though it covers so much ground, is very readable.

All social workers should read with care *Our Towns: A Close-up* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d. & 5s.), a study made in 1939-42 by the Hygiene Committee of the Women's Group of Public Welfare in association with the National Council of Social Service. The study has been based on the evacuation from the towns, and the Report makes many recommendations on the different aspects surveyed. Three of the first are:

1. Burial insurance should be taken out of the hands of commercial companies.
2. National Health Insurance benefits should be administered through the Civil Service and not through Approved Societies.
5. The profits and publicising of organised gambling should be strictly controlled.

Evacuation proved an eye-opener in many ways, and the facts revealed by this study show there was little exaggeration in the rumours about the condition of thousands of the children. The Ministers of Health and Education will find here support for legislative proposals long overdue.

We fear Mr. Henry Bettenson set himself an impossible task in attempt-

ing to compress *Documents of the Christian Church* (Oxford Press, 3s.) into a "World's Classics" compass. From most sides we expect the selection will be criticized; that is perhaps inevitable, but nobody will have more ground for criticism than Congregationalists: neither "Congregationalism" nor "Independency" appears in the Index. And when Mr. Bettenson speaks of a writer's book as "a masterpiece of compressed erudition" he might at least see that her name is properly spelt!

We have spent a pleasant hour with Mr. J. A. G. Bruce's anthology for youth, *Wisdom of Men* (Faber, 5s.). The selections, all prose, are classified under "Manhood", "The Fight for Freedom", "Man's World", "God's World". What kind of personality will readers give Mr. Bruce when we say that he is an Assistant Master at Rugby, and that his favourite authors as revealed in this anthology are R.L.S. and Prof. W. McNeile Dixon (6 entries each), the Archbishop of Canterbury (5), and John Milton and A. Clutton Brock (4 each)? We wish the source had been given at the head of each item; as often as not the page has to be turned, and the number given serves no purpose whatsoever.

In the admirable "Interpreter Series" (Allen & Unwin, 2s.) Dr. J. T. Sheppard's *Aeschylus, The Prophet of Greek Freedom* skilfully tells the story of the Orestian trilogy to demonstrate that Athena, the goddess of Right Reason, can still help men.

The Literature of England, 500-1942 (Longmans, 7s. 6d.), by Profs. W. J. Entwistle and Eric Gillett, will give readers pleasure and serve as a handy reference book. The stress is on contemporary literature, and that does not make the task of the writers any easier, for about many contemporaries there is as yet no agreed verdict. Often, therefore, we cannot tell what standard is being followed, the allocation of space is so arbitrary: in 282 pp. of text Mark Rutherford gets 6 lines, George Moore (under fiction) 22, and Compton Mackenzie 40; Hugh Walpole has 2 pages, Virginia Woolf and Max Beerbohm a page each, and Louis Golding 2 lines. To Religion less than a page is devoted; of the writers mentioned, two are foreigners, there is no Free Churchman, and the list given shows how the book of the moment is so close that it obscures the library a few years away: Mr. C. S. Lewis is so near that—we will mention Anglicans only—Mandell Creighton, B. H. Streeter, E. W. Barnes, A. C. Headlam, H. Hensley Henson, and A. E. Taylor cannot be seen.

Lord David Cecil's *Hardy the Novelist* (Constable, 7s. 6d.) is one of the best books of literary criticism we have read for some time. It reveals a love for its subject, a sensitive and balanced appreciation of his gifts, and an awareness of his failings. Lord David regards Hardy as "the last representative of the tradition and spirit of the Elizabethan drama . . . the last English writer to be built on the grand Shakespearean scale": in the novels we see "the Elizabethan world with the lights going down". If readers are affected as we anticipate, they will re-read the novels at once, both to test Lord David's criticisms and to see whether they agree with his order of merit. Hardy, we are told, was "a great artist, but not a great craftsman". Sometimes his pen or his story runs away with him, and he shows "an indefensibly muddled mind". Sometimes he writes of things not really part of him, with disastrous results, but when he writes of that which he knows, he reaches Olympian heights. Here is Lord David at his best:

Henchard and Eustacia may love and suffer and die; but the rustics go on. It is they who bring the children to birth, dance at the wedding, mourn at the graveyard, and speak the epitaph over the tomb. They are eternal as the earth by which they live. And their very pro-

saicness anchors the story to reality. It gives the reader a standard of normality by which he can gauge the tremendous heights and depths to which the main characters rise and fall. In his last two big novels, *Tess* and *Jude*, he leaves them out. And they lose by it. We feel them to give a distorted picture of life, as his greatest works do not. Nor, for all that they are drawn in so stylised a convention, are these figures unreal. Taken individually, they may seem exaggerated, but taken—as they are meant to be taken—in a corporate mass, they build up a picture of average mankind in its rural manifestation that is carved out of the bedrock of life.

And his worst? Readers may take their choice between the association of Jane Austen with Milton ("Their works are at once so brimful of personality and such exquisite examples of the form they have chosen that . . .") or this sentence, the bathetic ending of a very fine lecture: "But when Hardy's preaching mood is on him, preach he must, whatever muddles it gets him into".

Miss Margaret Watt has written a pleasantly discursive book in *The History of the Parson's Wife* (Faber, 8s. 6d.). From the wives of Calvin and Cranmer, Luther and Knox, she passes along to Susannah Wesley—there is little about Mrs. John!—Mrs. Kingsley, Mrs. Barnett, Mrs. Tait, Mrs. Creighton, and the rulers of Scottish manse. Mrs. Proudie, Mrs. Norris, and Catherine Elmsere figure in the chapter on fiction, where we should have liked to see Barrie's Babbie. Miss Watt notes the large families which were the rule for so long, and shows the courage and endurance of the women who bore and reared them. A large number of her heroines moved in the upper ranks of the clergy: in the lower ranks the ministers' wives have been heroines indeed; in large vicarages and inconvenient manse, with insufficient incomes and away from all their relatives and friends they have borne heavy burdens, often uncomplaining and generally without recognition or reward.

Miss Jane Lane has followed her biography of James II by a novel, *England for Sale* (Dakers, 9s. 6d.), which reveals the same characteristics—considerable writing ability and the power to tell a story combined with unbelievable prejudice. Miss Lane is fortunate in that people who have been dead a couple of hundred years cannot bring an action for slander.

EDITOR.

In *The Unity of the New Testament* (S.C.M., 5s.) Dr. A. M. Hunter (lately Yates Professor at Mansfield) falls into line with the revived interest in biblical theology. His contention is that the analytic approach to *N.T.* (Synoptic, Pauline, Johannine, etc.) must yield to the synthetic. There is a unity that transcends all diversities: the *N.T.* is "the story of salvation", and in this single cord the three strands are Christology, Ecclesiology, and Soteriology, one Lord, one Church, one Salvation. In this all *N.T.* writers agree. There is no index, but a useful summary and postscript. A good book, although (some would say because) written from the "right" wing.

Canon Alan Richardson's *Preface to Bible Study* (S.C.M., 5s.) is not concerned with literary and historical introduction, but with the Bible as a channel of divine communication with men. As such it deserves a wide circulation. An appendix contains sensible suggestions for the running of Bible Study groups. It is news to me that Peake's *Commentary* is published by A. & C. Black (p. 123).

External and internal evidence alike show that *Not by Bread Alone* (S.C.M., 5s.) is an American production. But for devotional reading—its topics are worship, prayer, Church membership, the Communion service—

it has relevance for this side of the Atlantic and for a wider public than the episcopal fellowship to which its author (Dr. Angus Dun) belongs. It is written in simple style but gets down to the deep things of life.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Dr. John Murphy was for some years Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester and at the same time a Tutor in the Lancashire Independent College. He has recently retired from both positions, and to mark his retirement has published some of the fruits of his teaching and research in *Lamps of Anthropology* (Manchester University Press, 7s. 6d.). It consists mainly of a series of articles and addresses published in various periodicals or read before learned societies. As chapters in a book they do not read very coherently, though they have an element in common in that they all bear more or less directly on problems connected with or arising out of the comparative study of religion. To that study Dr. Murphy makes some very real and useful contributions in the chapters on "Outgrown Theories in Comparative Religion" and "The Theory of an Original Monotheism", in which he makes short work of the well-known ideas of Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt and "The Place of Fear in Early Religion". Of a more general type are two admirable chapters on the development of the civilized mind and of individuality in the ancient civilizations. Very attractive too and beautifully written are the chapters on "Imagination and the Early Forms of Religion" and on "The Primitive Character of Poetic Genius", while the chapter on "The Indus Civilization" is a real contribution to anthropology. Dr. Murphy shows himself very much at home in the various aspects of his very big subject. His book as a whole should prove a useful introduction to it both for students of anthropology and of comparative religion.

W. B. SELBIE.

Mr. Shipley N. Brayshaw's *Post-War Employment for All* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) is suggestive but not instructive. It leaves the reader with a trail of unanswered questions on every problem raised:

Are the Industrial Federations to be single financial units in which the identity of the absorbed firms is lost?

Are banks to continue to create currency?

How is the Community to appoint directors and workers to share in the control of Industry?

If the present stimulus of profits to efficiency is limited or removed, will not this necessitate some form of efficiency audit by an outside authority?

The author clearly sees the dangers in his proposals, but does not definitely provide the remedy. He hints at national ownership, but leaves the reader guessing as to whether he thinks his proposals must inevitably lead to State-ownership or not.

The book will be read with interest by all concerned with Industry, and most of them will welcome a further and larger edition in which Mr. Brayshaw could deal more effectively with his many excellent and stimulating suggestions.

Mr. A. K. Turner's *Christian Citizenship* (Boston: Lincs. Standard, 6d.) is a challenging and provocative little book which ought to be read and studied by young people everywhere. It stands for the fundamental principle of Christian citizenship which places a higher value on human life than on any material possessions, and goes on to show how the application of this principle would affect the practice and structure of our industrial and financial life. The chapter on employment is particularly suggestive.

P. M. ROBINSON.

NEW EDITIONS.

MISS E. R. MCNEILE'S *From Theosophy to Christian Faith* (Mowbray, 4s. 6d.) is an edition, with new matter, of "a comparison of theosophy with Christianity" first published in 1919. Miss A. Ruth Fry's *A Quaker Adventure* (Friends' Service Council, 1s.) is an abridgment of the account (1926) of Friends' Relief Work in Europe. Sir Ronald Storrs has reason to be gratified in that his *Orientalisms*, which has passed through four editions since its publication in 1937, now appears in definitive form (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.). Sir Ronald contributes a new Preface.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

Dr. Stanley A. Cook's British Academy appreciation, *George Adam Smith, 1856-1942* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.), is finely done, and will be widely read. Miss Dorothy Sayers, having been accepted as a theological oracle, is in danger of falling heavily between two stools: her address, *The Other Six Deadly Sins* (Methuen, 1s.), shows her undecided whether to be a pundit or a "smart Aleck". Ripe wisdom and shrewd common-sense mark Dr. J. H. Clapham's Sidney Ball Lecture, *The Historian Looks Forward* (Oxford Press, 1s.). Mr. C. S. Lewis's *Christian Behaviour* (Bles, 2s. 6d.) contains eight broadcast talks, with four additional sections. *Speaking in Parables* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) contains Dom Bernard Clements's last broadcasts, with an appreciation by the Rev. Eric Fenn. Mr. F. J. Sheed's *Man the Forgotten* (Sheed, 1s.) is a clear and thoughtful examination of the nature of man. Ministers and workers among young people will find the Rev. Leslie J. Tizard's *Church Membership* (Indep. Press, 6d.) very useful. *Armour of Light* (Livingstone Press, 6d.) is the Rev. Cecil Northcott's Popular Report of the L.M.S. The Rev. Jack Singleton has compiled an order of service for Youth Rallies, etc., *A Celebration of the Four Freedoms* (R.E.P., 3d.).

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April). A very mixed grill, with Dr. Julian Huxley on "Man—The Trustee of Ethical Goodness", Dr. Inge on "A New Reformation", and the late Dr. R. R. Marett on "Natural Selection and the Lesser Folk". Two articles on life after death, the philosophical and theological survey by Dr. Mellone, a thoughtful contribution by Dr. William Robinson on "The State makes War, not the Church", and a searching study of *Grey Eminence* by Mr. Robert Sencourt, are included. Among other writers are Dr. Maxwell Garnett and the Rev. Cecil Northcott.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Fourth Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" and "By High Road and Country Lane" are refreshing as ever. Paul S. Cadbury discusses "The Problem of Urban Housing" and there are some interesting reminiscences of Lord Gainford and an account of the evolution of the F.A.U.

Expository Times (April-June). From the articles in these issues we select Dr. W. D. Niven on "The Disruption", Prof. John Foster on "Where Lies the Hope of the World?", Canon Grensted on Spiritualism, and Canon Roger Lloyd on Fatalism.

Evangelical Quarterly (April). Prof. J. H. S. Burleigh has assumed the Editorship in succession to Principal Donald Maclean, of whose work the Rev. W. H. Hamilton writes an appreciation. Other articles are the Rev. J. K. S. Reid's "The Church and the Modern State", the Rev. J. Warren's "The Plain Christian's Duty of Gospel Witness as set forth in the N.T.", and the Rev. P. W. Miller's "Light from the Patriarchs for our day".

International Review of Missions (April). An issue filled with timely articles and including an account of recent developments in Japan. Specially important are the Rev. Tiran Nersoyan's "Can Christians and Communists Meet?", Capt. H. Winkel's "The Jewish Problem", and Dr. D. A. McGavran's "Using the Present Adversity for Advance". The Rev. Noel Whitfield writes on "Christian Education in South Madagascar".

World Dominion (March-April). Two L.M.S. Secretaries, Dr. A. M. Chirgwin and the Rev. T. Cocker Brown, are among the contributors to an interesting number. Among other writers are Sir Stanley Reed, Dr. Wm. Paton, the Rev. A. McLeish,

Mr. T. Edmund Harvey, and Mr. O. M. Green. (May-June). Dr. J. Z. Hodge has an important article on "The Indian Scene", and Mr. Alan Benson an account of his tortures by the Japanese. We confess we should like to have the credentials of the "Consultant", who states he has been consulted by 12,000 people in the last year, which means over 30 a day. The Rev. W. V. Coombes describes the Lady Willingdon Leprosy Sanatorium.

Harvard Theological Review (January). The main articles are Dr. Louis Finkelstein's "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah", Mr. Campbell Bonner's "The Technique of Exorcism", Dr. C. C. Torrey's "The Name 'Isariot'", and Prof. John Laird's "Theism and Hypertheism".

Anglican Theological Review (January). Contains the papers and discussion at the 50th Church Congress. The subject was "Drift or Mastery in a Changing World".

Review of Religion (March). Prof. Karl Löwith writes on "The Historical Understanding of Kierkegaard", Mr. R. M. Krapp on "The Puritan 'Calling'", and Mr. Paul Shana on "The Meaning of Sacrifice". 60 pp. of reviews.

Religion and Life (Spring). An interesting number with Dr. Emil Brunner's "The Condition and Task of the Present-Day Church" outstanding. Dr. E. J. Goodspeed urges that "The Misprint that Made Good"—"strain at a gnat" for "out" should be corrected. Among other contributors are Dr. F. C. Grant, Dr. J. W. Nixon, and Dr. M. Spinka.

Review and Expositor (April). Dr. J. R. Sampey tells of the Southern Baptist Seminary's years in Greenville, S.C. (1859-1877), Dr. G. A. Buttrick writes on "What is the Gospel?", and Dr. H. W. Tribble on "The Christ of the Apocalypse". 70 pp. of reviews.

In *In Extremis* (July, 1942) Paul Gessler discusses *Die Stellung des Laien zur Theologie*, and Prof. Edouard Burnier presents *Notes sur la biblicisme*.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editor,

May I be allowed to remove a serious misconception which your somewhat tendentious review of *A Companion to the Communion Service* gives rise to? There are several matters I should like to reply to, but consideration for your space forbids me doing so. I find it difficult to believe that you were serious when you wrote, "there is no emphasis on the fact that the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacrament were invariably joined together". This you support by an arithmetical reference to 5 lines to the Sermon and 23 to the Offertory. (Incidentally there are 8 to the Sermon.) This only goes to show how unsatisfactory such arithmetical proofs are when applied to documents of any kind! At any rate, I have been reared in a tradition (springing from John Calvin through John Glas and Alexander Campbell—surely Reformed enough, if not too much reformed!) where early Communion Services and "after" Communion Services, in which Communion is often administered without any Sermon or instruction of any kind, are wholly unknown. The Communion Service is the main service of every Sunday, and the Sermon is always an integral part of it. It would have been strange, therefore, had I produced a Manual on the Communion Service which did not recognize the important part which the Sermon has to play in that service. Neither have I done so. In the section "Preparation for those who assist at the service" I deal with the Choir, Readers, Preacher, Servers, and President. Of the Preacher I say, "The preacher needs to prepare himself most carefully, and above all to remember that upon him devolves the sacred duty of delivering the Word of God to the people of God, and not airing his own pet notions, or delivering some pleasant homily". Again, in the section on "The structure of the service", the Sermon is naturally included. Finally, in my 8 lines I say of the Sermon, "this is equally an act of worship and a real part of the service of Holy Communion".

I leave your readers to judge whether your judgment is sound or not.

Yours sincerely,

W. ROBINSON.